

THE  
CHRISTIAN EXAMINER.

---

JULY, 1869.

---

ART. I.—ON THE STUDY OF GERMAN IN AMERICA.

*Abriss der Deutschen Literaturgeschichte.* Von DR. E. P. EVANS, Professor der neueren Sprachen und Literatur an der Universität von Michigan. New York: Leypoldt & Holt, 1869. 12mo. pp. 235.

A WORK in the German language by one who is not of German birth or lineage is certainly a novelty. Some of our best English works in theology, in moral and political and natural science, have come from expatriated Teutons; such as Max Müller, Dr. Lieber, Dr. Schaff, and others less widely known. Not a few of the ablest editors in the United States, from Carl Schurz downward, are Germans who write as vigorously and as gracefully in the English tongue as in their own. But this rule does not work in both ways, and there is little or no reciprocal writing of native Americans in the German dialect. The "Epitome of German Literary History," just issued by Leypoldt and Holt, is a rare instance in this kind. The author, Professor E. P. Evans, of the Michigan University, is already well known to our readers, by his translation of a work of Coquerel the younger, and of Adolf Stahr's "Life of Lessing," as well as by numerous articles in the reviews and magazines, all written in a style at once strong, clear, rich in humor and in scholarship. No book of the last decade has been more favorably received by the critics, or has done more to awaken new interest in liberal studies, than the translation of the "Life of Lessing."

In his new German work, Professor Evans shows that his command of the German tongue is as ready and as easy as his command of his native tongue. In a work so condensed, an epitome of the literature of more than a thousand years brought within the limits of a college text-book, it is of course unreasonable to look for high rhetorical finish or fulness. There is no room here for elaborate biography or description or suggestion or criticism. We could expect in so rapid a summary hardly more than an annotated catalogue. But the author has the skill to put a great deal into a single sentence. In a few lines he can give the writer his proper place and rank, tell to what school he belongs, and what is his significance in literature. Of the leaders in every school he is able to give a satisfactory appreciation ; and he marks distinctly the transition from one school to another, from one epoch to another. He has made excellent use of his ample materials, and has brought together here the results of wide and various German reading ; soon, we hope, to be expanded into a comprehensive English history of German literature, which is the desire of all German scholars. We want something better in this kind than the narrow and one-sided history of Menzel, which was foisted upon the public thirty years ago, as a fair account of German literature.

In the mean time, the present work of Professor Evans will be of great value to teachers of German and German classes, for whom, indeed, it has been specially prepared ; while it is useful in any library as a work of reference, supplied, as it is, with a full index, marginal indications, and a table of contents most ably drawn and arranged. It is precisely the book which German teachers have been wanting to get. Forty years ago a book of this kind would have had very small sale, and would have been passed almost without notice. Now such a book interests a public numbered by millions, and will be sent to all parts of the land. In the memory of many not yet old, German studies were eccentric, the sign almost of a disordered mind ; were discouraged by wise professors, and dreaded even by curious students. Half a century has not yet passed, since the first teacher of the German language

was appointed in Harvard College, and for a much shorter time has it been a favorite study in that institution. Before the year 1840, in Boston, the American Athens, there was less knowledge of German than of Greek, and most of those who went into raptures over Goethe and Schiller, knew these poets only through imperfect translations. To have suggested such a study as suitable in the schools, even of the highest grade, would have been treated as amazing assurance. In the English High School, French had a place, but German was not thought of. Of course, in the ancient venerable "Latin School," this upstart jargon of the barbarians could find no entrance. Even the most "select" school for youths or maidens, with the highest scale of prices, did not include this in its programme. German teachers, in Boston and in all our cities, were few and far between. The most incompetent men were able to go on undetected by the few pupils whom they enticed. The second teacher in German in Harvard College, the best that could be found, may have been a good soldier, but a scholar he unquestionably was not; and his pupils made sport of his simplicity. Nowhere at that time was German considered an essential part of the education of a gentleman, hardly even an ornamental appendage. There were some who studied it; but they studied it in difficulties, with scanty aids, with little sympathy from friends, and under a ban at once literary and theological. Fond parents disclaimed all responsibility for the vagaries of foolish sons and transcendental daughters, who would waste their time over such bewildering trash as the dialect of the beer-drinking Teutons. In no school or college, from Maine to Florida, had the German a prominent or a recognized place among the branches of polite learning, much less among the branches of useful learning. It came in rank after Italian and Spanish, far behind French and the classical tongues.

In one generation a marvellous change has come. The German language has been brought into the very front rank of ordinary studies. A college that has no teacher of this language now is a poor affair, not worthy of the name; and this is classed in many institutions as a "required study." It

is taught in the Normal Schools, it is taught in the High Schools, it is taught in every respectable "select" private school. It is a study not merely for adult pupils, but for children of tender years. Infants even learn it in the Kindergarten. The number of professional German teachers in the country is "legion." They abound in the cities, large and small; and they go westward along with civilization and settlement. They have a chance in Leavenworth and Omaha, as much as in Boston and New York. One can hardly take up a journal, metropolitan or provincial, without reading the prospectus of one or more German teachers. No bookstore is so small or so remote that German books do not make part of its stock, and help in its profits. Every considerable reading-room has German newspapers on its files. German is studied not only as a literary language, but for its social and practical uses. A housekeeper needs it, in many parts of the land, in her intercourse with servants and tradesmen; an employer needs it with his operatives. Children learn the language from their nurses and their playmates, before they are instructed in it from the grammar and the dictionary. Eminent educators, too, propose this language not merely as a supplement to classical training, but as a substitute for the classics, --insist that it is worth more than Greek, more than Latin, more than both together; that it may take the place, in school and college, of those dead tongues. They discuss in conventions, they discuss in reviews, they discuss even in legislative halls, the relative value of German and Greek; and the weight of authority is by no means heaviest on the ancient side. What the accomplished Chancellor of the English Exchequer says in disparagement of the scholarship which has given him fame, is more than echoed on this side of the ocean; and classical scholars themselves are willing to lament that they spent so much time upon pagan authors, to the neglect of the tongues which hold so much of living literature. According to Mr. Dilke, the sons of New-Yorkers all go to Germany for their higher education. This statement, like many others of his book, is a blundering extravagance; but the number of American students who go to Germany to finish their education is large

and constantly increasing, and there are not a few who go there even for elementary education. The frequent "Ph. D.," joined to the names on college catalogues, no longer exclusively marks some educated German exile.

This change has undoubtedly been brought about in large measure by the German emigration of the last twenty years. That element now forms an important part of American nationality, and in some States is able even to control politics and to dictate social customs. Milwaukee is more a German than an American city, and St. Louis has the customs of the Rhineland more than the customs of New England. The influence of the German language in the schools of the West has not come chiefly from interest in German literature, but from intercourse with the German people, who are omnipresent in that region. In the East, on the other hand, the new honor of the German language has come mainly from the revelation of its literary and scientific value, from the discovery of its treasures of knowledge and genius, and of its various beauties and capacities. The ample experience of its charm and its use has refuted all the objections that were urged against it, and has proved it as one of the fullest sources of spiritual strength and wisdom. The largest claim of the lovers of German studies is now freely admitted, and no one has to pursue them by stealth, or apologize for his folly. It is impossible to set aside the facts which vindicate this study, even in those departments where it was once most underrated. Whatever the opinion on the relative value of the ancient and modern languages may be, no one now denies actual value, and high value, to the German language; placing it next to the classics, at any rate, if not above them. There are instances, not rare, of men who have undertaken in middle life to make good this defect in their early training, and who have learned from their children the language which was unknown in their own classical course. The German language had in the beginning a hard struggle against the ridicule and against the prejudice which barred it out from the school and college; but it has won the day by its real merit and the persistence of its claim, and it now has firm foothold every-

where. The transcendental fancy, that it is the only language fit for philosophy and mystic rapture, has been sobered down ; and the equal mistake, that gave it rank above the English language, has been rectified. But there can be no doubt, that for practical purposes, for information on all subjects, for ideas, for intellectual excitement and pleasure, for all that makes a language valuable, the German is next to the English to-day in the study and the home of educated Americans. Even classical scholars, who vehemently defend the theory of their mediæval tradition, read, in most cases, ten pages of German daily where they read one page of Greek or Latin, and are indebted to German sources for their very defence of the classics which they glory in. The classic temple stands to-day only as it is buttressed by German scholarship.

The German language, as we have said, has fairly silenced the objections that were urged against it. These objections were of several kinds, and they had warrant in first impressions and in superficial study. The most important and influential of them was undoubtedly the *theological* objection. The "danger to faith" was set in the way, and many timid souls were frightened off from a study which seemed to be full of peril to the believing soul. Germany was the home of all fatal heresies, and the vice of these heretical ideas seemed to be fixed in the very structure of the language. There was a vague notion that this tongue was chiefly employed in denying all things which had come down from the early time as venerable in association or sound in doctrine ; in discrediting and denouncing every thing sacred, — the Word of God, the miracles of the Saviour, the existence of the soul, even the Divine Being ; that there was nothing too daring or too blasphemous to be attempted in a German book or a German lecture. If a theological student ventured upon this forbidden ground, he was solemnly warned of the probable consequence, and his spiritual ruin was predicted. To study German was to take the first step in unbelief. This idea was given out in the lucubrations of the religious press, in the fulminations of the orthodox pulpit, and even

from the professor's chair ; the professors and the preachers and the editors honestly thought what they said, for they knew no better. A good deal of the startling heresy that broke in upon the churches did come from Germany. A good deal that sounded like infidelity, and that was infidelity from the former stand-point, had unquestionable German parentage. It was natural to infer from these waves in the advance, what a deluge of heresy would roll in, if the flood-gates were opened. Those dreadful names, Eichhorn, Paulus, Gesenius, and Strauss,—the Beelzebub of the host,—seemed to present an infernal array against the Lord and his Anointed. "German theology," as many of us remember, was in the community and in the schools the synonyme of infidelity, if not of blasphemy. To be expert in this was a stigma, rather than an honor ; a crime of which one might be called to give account ; a disgraceful charge, which only the most positive confession of orthodoxy could fairly purge away. In some denominations, the confession of a love for German theology made the soundness of a candidate for the ministry doubtful, and hindered his settlement. "Is he tinctured with Germanism ?" was a question preliminary to all farther negotiation, when parish committees were inquiring about a pastor. This objection to German studies had more weight in the orthodox, than in the liberal sects ; but there were not a few Unitarians ready to take it up, and to be frightened by it.

How completely now the tables are turned ! How preposterous seems the charge which would make the heresies of a few writers the sentence of the literature of a whole people, or would allow the heresies of these writers to hide the truth which they themselves taught ! How childish and unaccountable seems that fear which made of a theology so rich and large and satisfying such a bugbear ! Now that the fright has passed, each denomination is eager to get all that it can out of this dreadful jungle of lions and tigers. The theological schools hasten to buy "in mass" the libraries of deceased German professors. Lücke's library is in one American school, Neander's library in another, and the Cornell University begins its grand collection for the great

university of Young America with the library of Bopp, whose work was chiefly in the sacred legends of Hindoo heathenism. The first books now commended to theological students, — in history, in commentary, in dogma, in all that relates to the customs or the thought of the Church, or the explanation and origin of the Bible, — are German books. There is not only no danger in these, but they are indispensable in any well-furnished library. All the theological reviews now have their quarterly notices of German theological works, and the most orthodox take pride in the fulness of their report in this department. The best thing in the Methodist Quarterly is its German summary. Without shame, the evangelical doctors confess that they get their latest and most accurate knowledge from the infidel land, where men are so careless of the Sabbath, and where the saving gospel is dispensed to such scanty audiences. There are compiled the great cyclopædias of the Bible and of theology, of which the English and American works are little more than diluted and garbled translations. There are found condensed, arranged, and judged, the latest results of investigation, discovery, travel, and conjecture, in all departments of religious knowledge. One who ridicules German theology now, in the face of the regeneration that it has wrought in this province of inquiry, — making science of what was only tradition; giving life to the dry bones, and clothing them with flesh and blood; changing the book of God from a dull fetish to a living tree, shapely in its proportions, and bright with various beauty, with blossom and fruit; tracing the development of religion in the human soul, as a natural growth, and not as a parasite fastened to the soul from without, — who ridicules German theology in the face of all these testimonies from every quarter, Catholic and Calvinist, as well as Unitarian and Rationalist, only shows his own ignorance or his own fatuity. In theology, the stone which the builders rejected has become the head-stone of the corner, as German authority is now the standard authority and the last appeal.

For it is the praise of German theology that it is so com-

prehensive and many-sided, so catholic and impartial. Every sect finds the latest word of its own theology in this tongue. The ancient Church is better represented in the great Cyclopædia of Wetzer and Welte than in any treatise that Rome has sent forth in the present age. Not the Vatican, but the Catholic professors of Germany, tell the faithful the lore of the Catholic Church. German theology is homogeneous in nothing but its exhaustive learning, and its freedom from cant. And one of the best services it has rendered to the religious writing of England and America is in clearing away so much of the cant, so many of the pious phrases, which were once mistaken for solid Christian teaching. One who has become familiar with this copious "real" theology, becomes impatient of mere verbiage, mere repetition of the formulas and commonplaces of the conference-room. It is instructive to compare the style of articles in the religious newspapers and reviews, as we have them now, with the style of the same articles thirty years ago, and to see how the phrases which gave color and consistency to the washing flow of religious rhetoric have been mostly filtered out; how men write now on religious themes in a dialect as simple and natural as if these were secular, and have forgotten the holy tones of the Fathers. This change is in large measure due to the study of German theology, in which there is so little of this holy tone. In Germany, the evangelical faith has no more a dialect of its own than the rationalistic denial. Each and both of them speak of religious things as they would of any other things; and they have taught our American revivalists to speak of the Holy Spirit and his work, of the way of the Lord, and of the salvation of men, as if these were actual things, and not processes aside from the actual life of men. A German scholar, in any sect, would be ashamed to tell his service and his experience in that style which was once so popular, not to say so necessary, in most of the evangelical churches.

German theology, too, gives something, and the best thing in every kind. Its cyclopædias are not only the most complete, but its monographs on special subjects — on minute

and recondite questions of history and criticism—are thorough in the highest degree. The general themes and the technical themes are treated with equal ingenuity and candor. In no theology is there such variety, such individuality, among the writers. That is one of the discoveries that we have made. We classify German writers by "schools;" but we find that the theological writers in that land, more than any other, are apt to leave the ranks, to make "excursions," and to disregard the rules of party drill. The study and influence of these writers have helped to emancipate our own sectarians from their strict allegiance, and to give a certain visible freedom, both of thought and expression. That there are so many freethinkers who are not infidels,—who are free while they profess to be orthodox and hold to the sound words of the creed,—who take their own way, and are not bound by the rules of the schools and by theological traditions; that there is so much individuality among our preachers and writers,—comes from the freedom which German theological studies have brought in. This influence is not less real than it is indirect, and that some of the ablest of these freethinkers are themselves not German scholars. The German spirit has found entrance, and has established itself in our methods of persuasion and appeal. Such writers as Bushnell, such preachers as Beecher, naturally come after the adoption of free ways of inquiring and thinking. If preaching has less power in the German land than it had in the middle age, the scholarship which Germany has sent out has given a larger range and a richer abundance to preaching in other lands. Even the staid dignity of the English Church has bent to take the gift, and has gained new elasticity of nerve and joint by that humiliation. Germany has dictated to Oxford, and the Broad Church redeems the desperate dulness of Anglican proprieties. In America, not one of the larger sects, and hardly one of the smaller, has remained unaffected by the influence of this free German air, so subtle and so penetrating. Baptist theology, Methodist theology, Universalist theology, have borrowed more than they know from the lore which was once under ban as the source of

spiritual perdition. Even those who still have fear, and hold to the prejudice which has been transmitted, make use of the teaching which they imagine themselves to shun, and sing, like the followers of Wesley, for sacred melodies, what are really the Devil's tunes.

Not the least of the good works which German theological studies have done, is the support they have given to scientific students and teachers. In the last generation, if a professor ventured to tell his class the doctrine of rocks and fossils as it was clearly written on the face of Nature, and to show how the world was created, there was no end of outcry; and his livelihood was in peril. It was almost impossible for an intelligent naturalist or geologist to be at once honest and orthodox. Now such a man has ample warrant in theological concessions and permissions for any scientific hypothesis. The revealed word of God has been unbound, and the scientific word need not be bound. The theological doctors will put no hindrance in the way of the "physicist;" or, if they do, he can confound them by their own authorities. German theology has brought freedom into other lecture-rooms than those of the theological schools, and has more debtors than the critics and the dogmatists.

This religious objection to German studies was the most important. But there were other objections not less confidently urged. It was said that the Germans were a *visionary* people, held "the empire of the air," were dreamy and unpractical, and that there was no satisfaction in attempting to follow their flights and vagaries. To study German was to bewilder the brain by idle and worthless speculations, to venture into a transcendental region where there was no foot-hold and no clear sight of any reality,—a region which was neither earth nor heaven. It was supposed that all the literature of this dreaming people was vague and obscure, where it was not fantastic; and adventure in it was compared to voyage in perpetual fog, depressing and disheartening, with no landmarks in sight, and no certainty of progress. Wise heads predicted that the fond enthusiasts would soon lose all spiritual reckoning in that aimless drifting, and be

happy enough to get back to the solid shore of English good sense. The first utterance of the transcendental philosophy partly justified this idea of the German language. If "Transcendentalism" were the German speech,— if the poetry and prose of the "Dial" represented the literature which they glorified,— one might be excused for doubting its transparency and its substantial worth. Its pilot balloons to these shores were certainly in large measure airy bubbles, bursting at the touch, with very small residue. It was no disparagement to the intellect of the giant Boston lawyer, that he could not understand what his daughters saw to be so beautiful, or that such clouds of words would not hold up the weight of his heavy thought and brain. "Orphic sayings," verses from the West, evolutions from the depths of consciousness, all that spray and spatter of German metaphysics would not commend the study which must be pursued in such mental confusion. To not a few practical men, German studies seemed to be a sign of hallucination and mental disorder; taking clouds for substance, ghosts for men and women, fantastic shapes for the forms of real things. They were denounced as substituting darkness for light, and interfering with all clear ideas of things actual, and of things abstract as well. Schleiermacher's talks, so profoundly unintelligible, were taken as the signs of all German speculation; and his name seemed happily to signify the special office of himself and all of his fraternity. Our practical men were pleased to say, that all Germans were "veil-makers," and that the language itself only lifted a mist, sometimes of violet and purple, but oftener gray and leaden, around those who strayed into its precincts. The warning was, that nothing substantial could come out of all this moonshine; and the mockery of the wise Preacher was turned to describe these fancies of the foolish soul, nothing but "vanity of vanities," airy nothings, with no habitation, and no name clearly defined or understood. That objection, too, reasonable as it seemed, has been quite fully set aside. Nobody makes the mistake now of assigning to the Germans the special realm of the air, or supposing that they are a race of speculators and dreamers.

On the contrary, the German emigration has proved that this dreaming people are especially practical, matter of fact, expert in mechanic arts, and more interested in real things than in any metaphysics or poetic fancies. And as we have come to know the German philosophy better, it is found to be as intelligible, as rational, and as near to real life as the speculations of the French or the Scotch schools, or the dry pleadings of "John Locke, Gent." If this philosophy is not accepted as satisfying, it is at any rate no longer stigmatized as flighty and fantastic. Kant and Schelling and Fichte and Hegel are no longer classed with Merlin the Enchanter or with mediæval mystics. Schleiermacher has honor as a reformer and a worker; and his centennial birthday is kept by the same men who would keep the birthdays of Bacon or Franklin. We go to the Germans now not only for philosophical ideas, but for the history of the philosophical ideas of all other nations, ancient or modern. They tell us better than any others the doctrines of the Greek philosophers, of the Hindoo and Persian sages; and bring into the comparison the ideas of France and Italy, of England and Scotland, better than any writers of these other nations. They have not less firm tread upon the earth, because they know the way of the air; and their aeronauts come down as easily as they go up. The camel evoked from the depths of consciousness is quite as genuine a specimen of the race as the stupid brute which the Englishman describes. We are disabused of the notion, that German philosophy confuses and bewilders, when we find men trained in that school so clear in their distinctions and so close and logical in their reasonings. The logical faculty is in no more danger now from the transcendentalism of the Königsberg philosopher than from the positive philosophy of Auguste Comte; and the study of that ideal system is commended as a good prophylactic against the materialist tendencies of the age. It is refreshing to rise a little way above this din and whirl of material forces into the serener region of abstractions, and to investigate the laws and ways of the pure reason. The very philosophy which was once ridiculed as visionary and bewildering is now a

relief from the worse confusion of so much tangle and cross-play of the exact sciences. Men go to it as to a country-retreat among the hills, where the rounded forms and the gentler music of nature may rest the soul from the scream of railway and factory whistles and the whirl of the crowded streets. Schleiermacher's "Reden" are commended as good bracing reading, purifying the spiritual atmosphere, and clearing away the smoke and the vapors which the cares of material gain and progress so thicken upon the souls of men.

Then there was the objection to the *language itself*, — to its structure and shape, to its words and sentences, to its involved movement and its guttural sounds. How should one ever get out from the endless labyrinth of its paragraphs? How should a well-placed larynx ever catch that jangle of unutterable compounds? The venerable Sales, so long pedagogue of the French and Spanish tongues in Harvard College, was wont to round off his praise of the other languages — English among them — with a contemptuous grunt, as expressing the sentiment of the barbarous Dutch: "*et la langue Allemande, c'est pour les cochons.*" What good could come from this jargon of Goths and Vandals? What sensible man would ever speak a language which gave no rest to thought, put always the cart before the horse, and went pushing its load of hard words all along the way? Were not these long periods, broken by parentheses, weighted with sesquipedalian words, bunches of roots upon one stem, beyond all human patience? Well might beginners despair of ever mastering a language in which the breath must be held so long, and the eye wander so wildly up and down. It was predicted that this complicated dialect, with its compounded words and its fearful prolixity of syntax, would spoil the simplicity and directness of the English style, and bring in mud to the wells of English undefiled. The verbosity without the smoothness of the old English pedants would return to the style which successive generations of nervous writers had made crisp and sparkling. Professors of rhetoric warned their classes against that fatal German style, wheels within wheels, nests of Chinese boxes, ending in a very small

box with nothing in it; verbs at the end of the sentence which ought to be at the beginning, and adjectives all set after their nouns. The very German characters had a forbidding aspect, and the case was worse still when these compounded words were printed in the Roman type. A language so constructed seemed only one degree better than Russian or Welsh, better fitted for a state of catarrh than for a healthy use of the vocal organs. Who could expect to keep a good English syntax with this habit of involved and compounded verbiage once acquired? In some quarters, the alarm was serious, and amounted almost to prohibition. It found help in the acknowledged difficulties of the study, so much greater in proportion than those of the French and Italian tongues. Here Latin gave no help, and in the false methods of teaching English did not give the help that it should have given. Only enthusiasm could overcome the difficulties which were in the form and arrangement of these agglutinated syllables,— the more puzzling that so many of them were new combinations, and not shown in the standard dictionaries. This linguistic objection hindered some from the study who had no fear of the theological or the philosophical cavil.

We hear no more of this objection. It has gone with the others. A better acquaintance with the German tongue has shown that the charges brought against its literary merit were groundless in the main. It is now confessed to be one of the richest, most copious, most convenient for use, most expressive, of all dialects. Even its musical character has been vindicated, and it now ranks with the highest in the combination of harmonies, and is only behind the Italian for melody. Every kind of music finds its instrument in this flexible language,— the ballad of the streets, the choral of the churches, the “part songs” and madrigals, and even the trills of the opera. There are not a few who prefer the German consonants to the Italian vowels for giving the light and shade of operatic music. No cadences can be more charming than the prose of Heine, or the verse of Goethe and Rückert, read by a skilful reader. While the usual German style is more involved and parenthetic than English or French style,

it is nevertheless, as we have learned, a good style when it is direct and simple. There is no commentary in English where the style is so concise as in the German commentary of De Wette. If the compounding of words lengthens them, it leaves the meaning clear, and soon ceases to trouble the reader. That damage to English style which was predicted from German studies has not been realized. Our best and most enthusiastic German scholars are also the best writers of their own language. Dr. Frothingham's translations, faithful as they are, might well be taken as specimen hymns of the purest original English. Dr. Hedge's mastery in the language of Twesten and Neander has not made him prolix or diffuse, or hindered that graceful flow of ornate and masculine diction which makes his essays such perfect instances of good English style. The style of our writers has lost no beauty in the last thirty years, but has rather been redeemed from its former verbosity and redundancy of epithet. Since the study of German literature has become so common, the best capacities of our English tongue have been brought into bolder relief, and the affected and pedantic manner of the last century has given place to a more natural manner. Our English style has gained freedom, has become more flexible, and has gone back to its Saxon origin and elements. The German studies have been aids in linguistic reform, visible in all our ephemeral literature as in the more solid works of science and history,—in the leading articles in the newspapers, in the magazine papers, in the criticism of the reviews, in the fugitive poems, and in the anniversary orations. That these are far better than in the last age, even in the matter of literary merit, every one confesses; and we may believe that the improvement is largely due to a familiarity with the language in which thought and reality are of more importance than epithet and sentiment.

And another delusion about German literature is now beginning to be dissipated. We have admitted that for various, wonderful, and exhaustive learning the Germans take the lead of all civilized nations, that their lore is the storehouse of exact wisdom on all themes: we have allowed them to be ex-

pert in lighter verse, in songs and lyrics of inimitable sweetness; but we have denied to them skill in novel-writing, and have believed that their efforts in that kind were only tedious, stupid, and commonplace. We have supposed that German novels were generally dull enough to make the romances of James even brilliant in the comparison, and that to read one of them was such a punishment as Lowell assigns to murderers in his "Fable for Critics,"—"hard labor for life." The lack of humor, the long disquisitions, the minute descriptions, the mixture of fact and philosophy, seemed to warn off all prudent novel-readers from this Sahara of romance, where bright palms and flashing fountains were only scattered at rare intervals on a vast waste of sand. That, too, is found to be a mistake; and now the most popular of all romances, historical, local, of costume and of character, of life in the city and life in the country, are translations from the German. What novels in these last years have been caught so eagerly and circulated so widely as the sensation stories of Louisa Mühlbach, trashy and untrustworthy as these are? (We are glad, by the way, to notice that Professor Evans makes no mention of this writer in his work, not regarding her as a representative or leading literary character: her reputation is far greater in this country than in her own.) Yet her novels are certainly not stupid. Do not publishers now contend over priority in the publication of the novels of Auerbach, with hardly less of feeling than over the novels of Dickens? Are not the names of Tautphœus, and Freytag, and Dingelstedt now associated with the names of Balzac and Charles Reade and George Eliot? The novels of Germany, of high life and of low life, have now a place in the best class of fictions, not only for solid worth, but as means of amusement. They are not read only by serious students, as sources of culture, but are hawked in the railway trains, to beguile the ennui of transit. No literature finds now a sale so large or so ready as this. Even the "dime novels" are fain to adopt it, and to change a little the style of their sensation. It is quite possible that German humor may find favor before long. Certainly the translations of Jean Paul Richter are as unique as any thing in their kind

in English ; and the wit of Hoffmann is quite as genuine as the wit of Thackeray. We have not yet, however, got over the notion that German humor is " very tragical mirth," and is of the sort that oppresses the soul with a sense of ponderous burden.

The German language has become a necessity to a scholar in any department. No writer on any topic, theological, historical, scientific, artistic, or economic, has full credit for mastery of his theme, unless he can show that he knows this language, and has made use of it. A Biblical critic who has no acquaintance with German, however candid he may be, however keen may be his insight, cannot be more than second rate. Historical criticism has been created in Germany, and most of its finest fruits are in the writing of Germans. Translations may, to some extent, supply the lack ; but no real scholar is satisfied to know foreign writers only through translations, or to get their help only through interpreters. No translation can ever give the whole meaning of the original, even when only facts are reported. The only sure knowledge which we get of the opinions and thought of foreign writers we get from their own words. Translations are better than nothing, and in many cases we must be content with them. Comparatively few scholars in our time have leisure or patience to read Plato in the original, and must do as well as they can with the versions of Plato by Cousin and Schleiermacher. But a living language loses much more in translation than a dead language, just as it is easier to copy a portrait than to paint an original picture. They who rely upon translation to give them all that they need to know in such a literature as that of Germany make a great mistake. A few of the masterpieces take on foreign dress. Goethe and Schiller, Neander and Tholuck, and a few of their class, become naturalized in English equivalents. Yet it provokingly happens to those who attempt investigations of any kind without knowledge of the German language, that the works which would serve them best are just those which have not been translated. The time spent in acquiring this language — which in the improved methods of teaching is so easily acquired — is never time

wasted to any who intend to investigate any subject of human knowledge. As mental discipline, too, the study is of the highest value: it trains the mind while it stores the mind. Such discourses as those of Schenkel, such essays as those of Rothe, such critical discussions as those of Baur and Volkmar, are mental gymnastics, calling every faculty of the soul into exercise. And a vigorous hater, like the passionate Ewald, brings the heart of his readers into the contest, and rouses hope and indignation alternately, as he shows how wisdom has been abused by the handling of bigots and sciolists in the history of the People Israel, and how unexpected light appears in the darkness. Where shall we find a commentary on the Scripture more suggestive than that of Olshausen, which drops in a phrase or a sentence the hint for a homily?

There are some who would discourage now the study of the German language, on the ground that there is danger that it may supersede the English in some parts of the country, and that it hinders the fusion of races into one people. The English is our national language; and we must keep this first in honor and influence everywhere, and compel all the races who come here to adopt this language. Other languages should be to Americans as mere accomplishments, and should never be allowed to become necessities of life. Some very intelligent men dread the multiplication of those German newspapers in the cities, as standing in the way of the process which should Americanize Germans, and holding them to attachments which ought to be broken. Already the strict puritanism of the evangelical sects is distressed and angry at the encroachments which German customs are making upon morality and order, the violation of the sabbath, the introduction of revels and masquerades and buffoonery, of beer-gardens and shooting matches, and riotous musical feasts. In the interest of good morals, it would discourage all favor to a language which represents a type of character and of life so unlike that of the fathers of the country. We do not want, they say, to bring the German life, or manners, or religion, to this land, though we may be glad when emigrants come to till our soil, to open our mines, or bring out our resources. We need rather to

shake off that yoke which German scholarship has laid upon us, than to fasten it more firmly. It is a sad confession that we must go to this foreign land for our light and our help, and that our intellect is dependent upon the German or upon any foreign people. But we need not be greatly troubled by this alarm. In the practical matters of life, in the affairs of public policy, we are as independent of foreign influence as we ever were, and there are other dangers to morals and religion which the German influence may help to neutralize. That the study of German literature has lowered the moral tone of American society cannot be proved. French literature is far worse in that respect; and the tone of German literature morally is higher than that of English literature. There is no such glorification of villainy, no such parade of indecencies, in the fictitious literature of Germany as in that of England and our own country. Until some worse harm shall come to morals than any that we have yet seen, we may permit German studies and advise them. The special virtues which we need to cherish as a people are the virtues which they will especially commend: family love, fraternal feeling, patriotism, economy, and perseverance. Thus far, we do not find among those who have given themselves to these studies any indifference to the higher virtues, or any hatred for practical righteousness. They are oftener foremost in all the philanthropic causes.

---

#### ART. II.—THE JESUS OF THE EVANGELISTS.

*His Historical Character vindicated, or an Examination of the Internal Evidence for our Lord's Divine Mission, with Reference to Modern Controversy.* By the Rev. C. A. Row, M.A. London: Williams & Norgate. 1868.

THE standard defences of the gospel history have combated the enemy by adducing the coincidences between the Old-Testament prophecies and the New-Testament events; by appealing to the independent testimony of the four eye-witnesses

by whom the Gospels were written ; and by showing the consequent necessity, if the Gospels were not authentic throughout, of supposing the preachers of the purest of religions to have committed wholesale fabrications. But the sceptical critics of modern times, quite outflanked this position. The argument from the Jewish prophecies they turned round, and made an argument against the authenticity of the gospel history. The "close coincidence" between the two was too close, they argued, for an actual historical coincidence, and was due simply to invention or alteration of the gospel records : whatever it had been predicted that the Messiah should do, Faith had undoubtfully attributed to and narrated of him. The Gospels they found, on closer examination, not to be from eye-witnesses, not first-hand documents, originally and wholly composed by one person, nor even wholly independent narratives ; but to have been worked over by different hands, founded upon either a common oral tradition, or upon common written fragments. The date of all of them, these critics asserted, was later than the apostolic age. Finally, the dilemma of the events of the Gospels being either true or conscious forgeries they evaded, by supposing them to be myths or legends, unconscious growths of the excited imaginations of the early Christian society.

Against this form of attack the old manner of defence was of no avail ; and the reasoning of the more recent school of Christian advocates, however able and sound, is too long, laborious, and minute, for popular use. Few people have either the time, patience, or opportunity of examining the quotations of Justin Martyr and the Apostolic Fathers. There is needed a course of argument more summary, adapted for popular use, starting with no presuppositions not admitted as self-evident. This is the want which our author would supply. His book has the great merit of taking up its subject in a method different from the usual one, and its work is well laid out.

Whether the Gospels be fictitious or historical, one thing is indisputable, — they contain a delineation of a great character which is exhibited over a wide field of action. It is,

moreover, admitted on all hands that the Synoptics were in existence, in all their main features, prior to the termination of the first century, and the fourth Gospel prior to the year 150. These facts Mr. Row takes as his starting-points. The existence of this dramatized portraiture of Jesus at that time is a fact which must be accounted for. Mr. Row aims to show that the mythic theory cannot adequately account for the existence of the Gospels, and the portraiture of Jesus which they contain, at the time when it is admitted that they existed; and that the only thing which can account for it, is the supposition that Jesus really existed as he is depicted in the evangelical records.

In the gospel narratives, Mr. Row maintains, there is represented in Jesus the union of a divine and human consciousness, a perfect holiness and a perfect benevolence, a suffering Messiah, a teacher of a new original morality, higher than the world had ever before known; and all these conceptions are carried out into minute detail, are dramatized over an extensive sphere of action. If this portraiture is only an ideal one, there must have been an infinite number of the most difficult problems to be solved by the elaborators of it, as to the mode in which these factors should be combined, the prominence given to each, the character of each of the particular events, anecdotes, and sayings by which these conceptions should be illustrated.

Every different originator of a myth would be likely to do this in a different way. Is it conceivable, then, that if the portrait of Jesus in the Gospels was the spontaneous growth of the imagination of his early credulous followers, the result should have possessed the unity that it does? that these should exist in all the unmistakable style of one original character? Even were there existing in Jewish literature the abstract conception of the Messianic character, there would still remain the same difficulty as to the detailed dramatization of it, and the same impossibility of different creators of mythical stories uniting in producing such a completely harmonious portrait. But not even the abstract idea was in their possession. Examine the prophetic books, unbiassed by the

usual evangelical desire of finding there resemblances to the gospel history, and you find only a number of vague undeveloped outlines, destitute of substantial form or coincidence with the gospel events. They are types rather than prophecies: they refer to actual events and individuals, exaggerating the one and idealizing the other; or else they are idealized personifications of the Jewish people. This statement agrees substantially with the views of the late Dr. Noyes, as expressed in the introduction to his translation of the Prophets.

In the later apocryphal works of Jewish literature, there is a very much closer and more direct coincidence with the image of Christ in the Gospels; but even these would not have been sufficient as a model in the fabrication of a detailed portraiture of the Messiah. They give only dogmatic statements or general elements, not a detailed picture,—abstract ideas, not concrete realities.

Moreover, the Messianic ideas prevalent among the people from the prophetic period to the advent were ideas of a national military deliverer,—ideas directly opposite to the conceptions elaborated in the Gospels. Now myths, being the spontaneous products of men's imaginations, embody the feelings, passions, and tendencies of the people among whom they arise. They represent their general notions about God and man, and the relation between them as they are reflected in the inventor's mind from the society in which he moves. The creator of a myth is limited in his field of invention by the religious and moral atmosphere in which he lives. A myth which did not embody the general conceptions of the day, would inevitably fail to get currency. When a number of different inventors are engaged in mythical creations, it is inevitable that the results should vary in conformity with the individual peculiarities of those at work in elaborating them; and even a certain unity of type in the midst of this diversity is possible, only as long as they adhere closely to the type of thought by which they are surrounded. The moment they vary from it, their creations must produce as great a divergence of type as the number of minds engaged in their elaboration. Just in proportion as the mythologists rise above the

conceptions of their times, or introduce improved ideas in religion or theology, their pictures must inevitably vary from each other. This would be still more the case, if the mythologists were persons widely separated by place, mental endowments, and nationality, as the early Christians were. Is it conceivable, then, that out of preceding Judaism there could have been elaborated, by a succession of mythical creations, a portraiture of the Messiah so different from and superior to the Jewish ideas, and yet one possessing such a unity of character throughout, as that of Jesus in the Gospels does?

Moreover, the period of sixty-five years, from the death of Jesus to the end of the first century, when at least it is admitted that the Synoptics were in existence, is not sufficient time for the mythical development of the delineation of Christ in them out of the religious, moral, and Messianic ideas of Judaism. The growth of myths is slow. This may be seen both by considering the conditions of their growth, and the examples of the Greek myths, and those of the Christian Apocrypha. And this period of sixty-five years must, besides, be reduced to a period of only twenty-five years; because we have, in those Epistles of St. Paul whose genuineness is unquestioned, the outlines of the character of Jesus substantially the same as in the Gospels.

That the Gospels are not mythic in their origin, is shown also by a comparison of them with the apocryphal Gospels. These latter show what would have been the character of the four Gospels, if they had originated in myths. Nothing is more striking than the contrast between the seriousness, dignity, and life-likeness of the four Gospels, and the puerility, absurdity, and evident fictitiousness of the apocryphal Gospels.

Such is an outline of Mr. Row's argument for the authenticity of the portraiture of Jesus in the Gospels, against the mythic theory of Strauss. It is conducted with scholarship, ability, decorum, fairness, and point. It is free from the flings, declamations, and denunciations, which are apt to deface modern defences of evangelical Christianity. His argument we regard as valuable and substantially sound. There are in

the Gospels unmistakable traces of a multiplicity of narrators, and yet the work of all possesses a substantial unity, and combines into an harmonious portrait. Is such a result conceivable, unless there was one real original, whose likeness they all sought to represent? As well suppose that our portraits of Washington were formed by a multitude of artists, each making independently a fancy sketch of a single feature of an ideal Father of his Country!

Many of Mr. Row's minor points and arguments, however, we should object to. He is apt to make Jesus more superhuman than the records justify, and many of his statements in this direction are too unqualified. He argues a great deal from the union in Jesus of a divine and a human consciousness. Now, many who hold to the authenticity of the Gospels, do not find there any proof of a divine nature in Christ. Mr. Row's aim is to conduct his argument upon the basis solely of grounds admitted by all sides, or of facts which are patent. He should not, then, rest so much as he does upon a supposition so unanimously rejected by his opponents, and even by many who agree with him in his conclusion, as the supposition of the divine nature of Jesus is.

It is the original form of Strauss' theory,—that, namely which found the origin of the gospel narratives in myths exclusively spontaneous and unconscious,—that Mr. Row combats. The change which Strauss has made in his theory in his *New Life of Jesus*, by supposing the agency of conscious and designed invention, as well as unconscious, would obviate somewhat, though not entirely, the objections to the mythic theory which Mr. Row has set forth. The supposition of intentional fabrication by the authors of the Gospels is, however, so repugnant to the mind of almost every one, so inconsistent with the lofty moral and spiritual tone of the Gospels, and the sacrifices and sufferings to which their adhesion to the gospel history and doctrines exposed the early Christians, as to be incapable of ever gaining much acceptance. The supposition is an injury instead of an improvement to the un-historical theory of the origin of the Gospels.

Mr. Row's is, then, an able refutation of the position, that

the evangelical records have little or no truthfulness, and that the portraiture of Jesus in them is not a true representation, for the most part, of an historic reality and original. So far, Mr. Row has, we think, been successful in his demonstration. But our author has endeavored to push his argument to the disproof of *any* mythical or legendary ingredients at all in the Gospels, and to the demonstration that Jesus must have been more than human. For this his argument seems to us quite insufficient. The view that there is no mythical or legendary ingredients in the Gospels, is beset with as many difficulties as the view that it is entirely mythical or legendary. The objections which lie in the way of the latter view do not exist against some mixture of legendary or mythical elements, in accounts mainly historical. In such a case, the already existing historic representation would serve as a fixed concrete pattern for imitation by the legendary or mythical additions, and enable them to exhibit the same general features in unity with each other and with the historic original. The theory of a mixed origin of the Gospels is the only one that escapes both Scylla and Charybdis: it is easy and natural. Such legendary or mythical exaggerations, or additions, are common halos, which form spontaneously round almost every great genius. There are few great men of antiquity, few illustrious saints of the Middle Age, few extraordinary men of modern times, even, in regard to whom characteristic fictitious stories have not been current within a generation after their death, often during their own lifetime. They are the gigantic images of mist which always attend a man who walks the broken heights of history. As Hermann Grimm has said so well in his Life of Michael Angelo, "Occurrences do not remain stable and unchangeable in the bosom of the general memory, but it rolls the facts to and fro until they become rounded and worn into a new shape." The more characteristic of its subject a story is, the more likely, almost, is it to be an invention. It is the concrete form in which the popular idea of a man has embodied itself; as, for example, the well-known fictions that Napoleon ran with the colors in his hand over the bridge of Arcola in the mouth of the Austrian cannon; that Cambronne

said, "The guard dies, but never surrenders;" that Racine died of chagrin because he had fallen into disfavor with the king; that Nero set Rome on fire to see it burn; and other similar examples.

In the chapter on "the influence of the supposed purely human character of the historical Jesus,"—the least satisfactory chapter in the book to us,—Mr. Row takes the position that Jesus, if merely human, could not have been independent of, or risen above, the national, mental, or moral ideas which surrounded him. Certainly he could not, if he had been an ordinary man. But no one supposes him to have been an ordinary man: no one supposes him to have been any other sort of man than a most extraordinary one. To say that his character is not within the possibilities of humanity, is to assume that we know already all the capabilities and powers of humanity; a supposition the same in character as that of the sceptic, who will not allow that there has ever been a miracle, because a miracle is not within the possibilities of nature. In point of fact, Jesus does not appear so independent of the environment of his age and nation as Mr. Row asserts. The critics have pointed out many decided traces of its influence in his life and ideas, and have found the elements of his teaching, and parallels to many of his most striking sayings in the Jewish Scriptures and literature. In regard to those ideas of his which were opposed to the prevalent ones of his times, it should be remembered that a *reaction* against current ideas is not uncommon, and as much a natural result of them and an evidence of their influence, as conformity to them. That wonderful and incomparable flower, whose beauty streams from Galilee over the whole world, did not, nevertheless, grow suspended in the air, but was sprung from a Jewish root, elaborated by Jewish nutriment, and tinted with Jewish hues. Only so could Jesus have come enough in contact with his age and nation to get any purchase upon them. Only so could he have got into such nearness and relation with them, as to gain the leverage whereby to fulfil his providential mission of giving to it a motion and a revolution that should in time extend to the whole world.

**ART. III.—ON THE ALLEGED UNATTRACTIVENESS  
OF THE CHRISTIAN PULPIT.**

AT the dedication of the First Unitarian Church in New York, on Saturday, Jan. 20, 1821, the records of the Society do not tell us who officiated in the other services; but on the printed programme we find, in the beautiful handwriting of the first clerk, against the sermon, the then already brilliant, the now illustrious, name of Edward Everett. Although only twenty-seven years old at that time, Mr. Everett had lately returned from a European tour, and become established as Greek Professor at Cambridge, after having been for two years the distinguished pastor of the Brattle-street Church, in Boston, following with not unequal steps in the shining pathway of the lamented Buckminster,—of all American preachers, perhaps, the most fragrantly embalmed in the memory of the lovers of eloquence, scholarship, and piety. At that early age, Mr. Everett had attained the full maturity of a great local reputation as a scholar and a Christian preacher; and, when the best and most attractive talent New England could furnish was wanted to adorn so important an occasion, he was selected for the honorable duty.

It is not our purpose at this late day to reopen the question of Mr. Everett's merits and services. But in offering some thoughts on the alleged unattractiveness of the pulpit to the highest abilities in our generation, it seems not unnatural to adduce Mr. Everett's example. Some light may be thrown upon the general disposition of men of shining ability to avoid, or to forsake the Christian ministry, by simply asking the question why Mr. Everett, so fitted and furnished by nature and grace to the service of the Christian Church and the Christian ministry, quitted so early the pulpit he adorned, and left the profession he had so laboriously qualified himself to fill? Such an inquiry would be impertinent, conducted in a merely personal way, or pressed into particulars; and we have no such purpose. Nor would it be instructive if it were

to end in discovering merely private and personal reasons for the change; such as broken health, sudden accession of fortune, modification of theological views, conscious disqualification for clerical functions, impatience of ministerial restraints, or ambition of more brilliant pursuits. But Mr. Everett was an example of a considerable class of scholarly, gifted, eloquent, and able men, who have forsaken the pulpit, to enter upon literary, philanthropic, or political vocations. It has become, to a certain extent, a reproach, that men of the first order, straying, under the self-ignorant proclivities of youth, into the liberal pulpit of this country, have soon found themselves out of place there, without adequate scope for their powers, and irresistibly tempted to leap over its narrow barriers into the open arena of public life.

One thing we may fairly say at the very threshold,—that it has rarely happened that any men leaving the Unitarian pulpit, have disgraced their profession while in it, or after quitting it; exhibited any evidence of the declining power of moral or religious principle in their hearts and lives, after dropping their clerical robes; or given the least support to the worldly scandal, that they found their faith, on maturer consideration, a merely professional prejudice, or their purity and piety to be only badges of office. From what other body of men, in proportion to their numbers, has this country drawn so largely its men of letters, its poets, historians, and statesmen, as from the Unitarian denomination, and even the Unitarian pulpit? and in what class are we to look for more practical evidences of a controlling sentiment of moral and religious obligation? Certainly, we have no reason to say, that our ministers, ungowned only of their own choice, have disclosed the nakedness of their own religious characters, when taking again the place of laymen in the secular spheres of life. They have uniformly (in all the higher instances) retained all the respect and veneration they had as ministers; and, like Mr. Everett, testifying to the last his continued faith in the religious opinions he had taught in the pulpit, and his fidelity to the high standard of purity and piety he had there upheld, have lived and died in the communion of that church,

of which, having once been ministers, they always continued ornaments and pillars.

Still, it is none the less true that a surprising number of our ablest men have left the pulpit; and that, too, after having succeeded in it brilliantly; and the reason for it continues ungiven. Doubtless, this has been partly due to the fact, that the characteristic training and views of the clergy in this country, especially those of large and liberal views, have qualified them, in a marked degree, for posts requiring broad, high, and thorough culture; and thus made them specially open to such demands. You cannot make poets, historians, critics, philanthropists, political economists, statesmen, judicial reformers, out of sectarian, half-educated, bigoted, and narrow men in or out of the pulpit. A young, forming country, pressingly in want of leaders, guides, lights, and ornaments, offers enormous inducements to the few men of thorough culture it possesses to step into its vacant thrones of power, and assume sway over its largest domains of influence. That alone has not only drawn from the pulpit many of its most illustrious men, but it has doubtless kept hundreds more from entering our ministry, who would have adorned it. The abler and weightier minds in America throughout the whole country, and from all religious persuasions, no longer gravitate towards the ministry, but away from it,—not perhaps from feeling its attractions less, but the attractions of other professions and pursuits more. In short, the rewards, the inducements, the calls, which the material interests of this new country present, with the professional, scientific, economical, and commercial vocations under which they are more directly to be developed, now draw away into civil engineering, mining, surveying, exploring, overseeing; into banking, trading, and navigation; into the law, with its new specialties of patent and of commercial law; or into medicine, with its scientific attractions at a period when the physical sciences are so engrossing and fascinating,—far the largest part of our rising young men of ability, and leave the pulpits of all denominations comparatively stripped of men of marked powers and influence.

There has been one excellent consequence of this common misfortune. The general intelligence of the American mind has, during this decline of pulpit predominance, escaped from the oppressive power of the priesthood. Nothing can be clearer than the emancipation of the laity of this country from the old thraldom of ecclesiastical discipline, either in respect of opinions, or of conventional standards of conduct. The old rules and the old creeds are not abolished, but the feeble hands that administer them are too conscious of relative weakness to seek to enforce them. The nation has thus broadened its being,—intellectually, morally, and practically; and it will henceforth be impossible to keep the new wine, full of fermentation and power, in the dried and contracted skins, — the old bottles that once held it.

But other effects of this degeneracy of the pulpit have been correspondingly mischievous. When the clerical office becomes relatively weaker and lower than the other professions, then, while general intelligence and personal independence may improve, while formal and technical piety may give way to a more natural and practical goodness, while religion, instead of running deeply in the channels of professional or church pietism, may overflow the common level of life, and diffuse itself noiselessly through all the soil of human interests; yet, finally, it comes to pass that the stream of religious faith, and of the practice which is fed by faith, feels the decay of the fountains, or the weakness of those appointed to tend them, and who allow their sources to be clogged. A feeble pulpit, a ministry respected only for its office, has, again and again in history, accompanied or foreshadowed the decline of morals, and of practical righteousness. We firmly believe in the absolute necessity of an able, faithful, and inspiring Christian *pulpit*, to maintain the faith of society in spiritual realities; to lift up ideal standards of character; to hold fast the tender and inestimable traditions of the Christian faith; to urge upon occupied and passion-led men the serious truths, obscured to their downcast eyes, but affecting and involving every moment's real happiness, and their whole future; to present, with thoughtful meditation, the sublime

idea of the presence of a God, hidden to the view of those beating up and walking in the dust of their hurried pathway through present cares and level interests; to vindicate the right of Jesus Christ to reign in the heart and mind of those who bury him in a dead historical past, and know not that he lives and speaks and moves to-day in the believing hearts of his prayer-taught and spirit-led disciples; to contend against the overweening testimony of the outward senses in favor of the evidence of the inner witnesses of the soul; to plead for what is permanent and eternal in the presence of dazzling temporalities and glittering decays; to humble the proud with the vision of divine greatness, and to exalt the lowly and abased with the sense of their own spiritual dignity and lineage; to awaken the conscience drugged with the cordials of pleasure, and the opiates of habit; to stimulate the spiritual eye, which disease has covered with a blinding cataract, by the healthful tonic of heavenly light, and arouse the inward man, prostrated and enslaved by the outward man, to assert his patent of nobility, and rise against and subdue his vulgar oppressor; to contend with a larger learning, a deeper insight, and a higher logic against the fallacies of pseudoscience, or the precipitate judgments of so-called practical experience, in favor of the historical truth of the Christian religion; and, in place of apologies for faith, turn upon the infidel, the materialist, and the secularist, the weapons of his own warfare, and compel him to answer for his unbelief and his low and vulgar conceptions of God and life and human destiny!

Let those great functions of the Christian pulpit fall into feeble and timid hands, fall into any hands weaker than those that steer the ship of state, handle the law, or the sacred mysteries of the human frame, or manage the immediate interests of human industry, and of social and economic life; and while, for a time, society may continue to live and thrive upon the accumulated capital of a faith and a piety which many generations of reverence and religious fidelity have stored up, it will sooner or later come to the end of its resources; and, like a country in the second or third year of its

drought, when not only its shrubs and its grasses fail, but its very forests begin to die, and its wells of water dry up, a moral desert will drift its sands, and blow its stifling simoons through the palaces and the altars where men once ruled and prayed.

But we have not yet reached the bottom of the inquiry, why the larger minds of this country have passed by the pulpit, grand and glorious as its functions are, to enter other departments of life. It is due, essentially, to the fact, that the so-called secular interests of the world have been for our generation, moving forward on a scale of vastness, employing and developing an ability, leading on, and disclosing, as their path was followed, truths of a majesty and importance which have left the established religious creeds and usages of all churches in an incongruous and somewhat narrow and unattractive condition. Acquaintance with man's nature and capacities, with man's terrestrial residence, with the laws of society, the laws of trade, the laws of the human body, and the human mind; study of politics, of science, of medicine, of jurisprudence, of mechanics, of chemistry, of the conservation and correlation of forces, of the philosophy of history, of the religions of the past, of geology and astronomy in their bearings on the Mosaic cosmogony, of literary criticism in its relations with the authenticity and genuineness of the scripture text,— all these studies, partly theoretical and partly practical, have so far stretched the area of human thought, enlarged the field of experience and opened the horizon of speculation, that the theology which descended from the Reformation and the Puritans has, while still enjoying the formal respect of the majority of Christians, lost its hold upon their practical understanding, its place in the line of their other interests, or its agreement and congruity with their general mental attainments and convictions. What has our popular theology to do with the statesmanship, the philanthropy, the science, the law-making, the customs and ways of our national, domestic, and social life? How much had a theological alarm for the slave's soul in another state of being to do with the anti-slavery convictions which have almost emancipated from bondage the

negro race in this country? What sort of consonance is there between the alleged and popularly assumed dogma of human depravity — total and absolute — and the practical respect paid in our day to human nature, its instincts, rights, claims to education, and proclivities to justice and truth? How does the dogma of imputed sin or imputed righteousness agree with the ethical and practical judgments upon which our criminal law and our medical jurisprudence proceed? What influence does a claim to a technical conversion possess over men's judgments respecting the integrity and trustworthiness of a man's character? How much does the assumption that Jesus Christ is *God* in any true and proper sense — although he is literally alleged to have made the worlds — affect the opinions of men of science, in exploring the works of the Creator, or in unfolding his laws? Now, until theology is brought up to the experience and actual state of men's convictions, attained through other and independent sources, it cannot hope to regain its old place at the head of the sciences where it belongs. Nor can its teachers (whether in the schools of divinity or the pulpit) be expected to represent the higher order of men and minds. Largeness and elevation of power are incompatible with intellectual insincerity, with mental equivocation, with verbal evasion, with the professional necessity of "paltering in a double sense." Religion and theology, to be taught with power and by powerful minds and hearts, must regain the genuine, honest, uncompromised faith and confidence of men; must move untrammelled, and with the same freedom that literature, science, law, and medicine claim and use; must lose all spectral, superstitious, and merely conventional character, and be clothed in the garments of modern conviction and positive immediate reality.

Meanwhile, let us carefully note, that the sober, respectful scepticism, not always conscious, which has come over the American mind of this era, in regard to the creed of Christendom, has not touched the respect which is felt for Christianity itself, or the desire to uphold and promote it. We venture to say, that what are called lower — that is, scholarly and honest

— views of the inspiration of the Scriptures have not diminished the reverence paid to the Bible, or the influence of that sacred book; that both the ethical and the spiritual elements of the New Testament are now in higher honor than ever; that more of Christ's religion has passed into politics, ethics, and philosophy in our time, than in any previous day: and this, for the very reason that the old barriers, shutting religion up in its own domain, separating the God of nature from the God of grace, and pronouncing life profane, and only the Church and the future sacred, are broken down. During the Roman Catholic ages, the church took the world into its own bosom, and had faith enough in itself, to impose its rules and ideas over the whole of society; so that its pleasures, cares, business, politics, were all ecclesiastically legitimated and sanctioned. Of course, it diluted piety and secularized sanctity by this course; but it preserved breadth and some sort of large and generous connection between faith and affairs. When the Reformation took Christianity up, it instantly shut the church gates upon the world; let in only its chosen and elected disciples, and pronounced a ban upon men and things, as much broader and deeper than ever Pontiff thundered forth, as the human race is larger than any sect or city or private heretic. The world is now turning Catholic again,— not *Roman Catholic*, but true Catholic. That is to say, it will have no church smaller than the human race; no Saviour less than a universal Saviour; no religion shallower than the human soul, or less diversified and various than human life; no creed that does not acknowledge — what it knows to be true — the worth and essential rectitude of human nature, the impartial Fatherhood of God, the legitimacy of human instincts and the significance and glory of human life. The Catholic Church, in its modern and divine dimensions, takes in saints and sinners, life and death, time and eternity, pleasure and prayer, week-days and Sundays, science and revelation, instinct and inspiration, nature and grace, body and soul. And at the head of all, under God, Maker of heaven and earth, of man and angels, of soul and body, it puts Jesus Christ, the friend and Saviour of sinners, who came to unite God and

man, heaven and earth, to adorn and dignify our nature, and to illustrate and glorify human life, and conquer even death itself; who pronounced the sabbath to be made for man, and not man for the sabbath; who whipped traders in religion out of the Temple, spurned Pharasaic pride, wept over fallen virtue, embraced the penitent, took feeble infancy and trembling womanhood under his protection, went about doing good, and died blessing his persecutors, and trusting implicitly the very God that left him to perish of his own fidelity and holiness.

To get this, the real creed of Christendom, fitly stated and acknowledged, is the problem, the sublime duty, and immortal vocation of the religious thinkers and leaders of our age. This is what the pregnant heart of our immediate future labors with. We know how all great reformations of science, politics, manners, religion, are predicted and preluded by struggling efforts and intimations; as the grand theme of a noble symphony, taken up in broken hints, by opposite instruments, — flute and horn, viol and reed, tossing from one to the other the tangled thread, — weaving in their chords with ever-thickening harmony and clearer purpose, until, — all the forces mustered and brought into line, — the whole vast orchestra breaks into the majestic movement, so long predicted and so carefully and richly prepared for; and, melody and harmony made one, the musical revelation bursts forth, complete in thunderous sweetness and soul-compelling beauty and sublimity. So it is with all the great movements of the human mind and heart; so with political, so with religious reformations. For half a century, the creed of Christendom has been promising, more or less clearly, a new reformation. Yet so bound up was it with the learning, the prescriptive rights, the family pride, the university subscription oaths, the conventional usages, and even the landed and pecuniary inheritances of the chief nations of Christendom, that it was next to impossible to loosen truth from the moorings of error, and unharness the heavenly and deathless steed from the broken chariot of use and wont. But this unnatural conjunction is, in its essence, temporal. It may be long, but it

cannot be for ever. We who belong to a body of Christians among the earliest and the most outspoken in our protest against the erroneous dogmas of the popular creed; who, for nearly a century, here and in England, have pleaded for the dignity of human nature, the derived and created position of Jesus Christ, the rights of reason and untrammelled criticism in the study of the Scriptures, the rationality of Christianity, and the untechnical and practical character of religion; who have been put outside the pale of the so-called evangelical churches, denounced as infidels, enemies of the cross of Christ, deists, atheists; who even now are denied the sympathy and fellowship of our fellow-believers, solely for this protest, without any pretence that we are less pure or Christian in our lives and characters,—we who have seen this sacred work of reformation, so long delayed in the church, have felt that it was all the while going on in the world, in literature, science, politics; and that the day would come when the church would meet a tide flowing in from the popular heart and soul which would flood it with the very ideas we have tried so long with our small reservoirs and smaller pipes to carry into the creeds of the church. That day has come; and, as when one goes out with lanterns in the small hours of the decaying night to fight against the darkness, and suddenly meets the dawn, we cannot but feel that Liberal Christianity, coming in like the broad daylight from all round the horizon of experience and thought, is soon destined to extinguish our tapers and candles, in a general flood of day.

We can have no possible anxiety about the creed of the next century. It will take care of itself, and be as liberal and generous as our utmost desires. But the present and the next generation will be between the new and the old, and very largely fall into the emptiness and vacuity of the transition. Liberal Christians have for the next quarter of a century their most glorious opportunity; this is the providential day of their power, the harvest-time of their long and often hopeless labors. Let them only think what the progress, the purity, the intelligence of society would be, if their religious

views and feelings consciously pervaded the nation; what a change would come over the manners, the business, the domestic life, the amusements, the whole complexion of things; and it will inspire them to any necessary sacrifices in behalf of their precious faith, and convince them of the duty of devising the most energetic measures to uphold and propagate their Christian creed and theory of religion.

There is a general conviction pervading the whole liberal body at this moment, that the time for action has arrived. We have noble schemes for reanimating our whole work. We want to set in motion each and every part of our machinery by a grand concerted movement; to invigorate with a manly life our literary and denominational organs; to diffuse our opinions by earnest missionaries and by wide-spread essays, expressly prepared to meet the new times; to organize still more completely our whole body by formal and thoroughly representative delegations, in our national conference, meeting biennially, with authority to originate and carry out general denominational schemes; further, to endow Antioch College as the great central seat and fountain of our Western influence, by means of a liberal education of the promising young men, whom, we believe, the New America, now rising from the ashes of our late war, will send us as the prophets and priests of an emancipated future; to enrich Meadville, and make it at last what we always meant it should be, a chief source of our coming ministers; meanwhile, to do the best we can to uphold feeble churches; to found new ones in all great centres; to broaden, by new and more active measures, the influence of those that already have life and power; to take possession of the open domain of the Pacific Coast; and to reap the glorious harvest which waves in the light and heat of the national reawakening, which has torn as many chains from the whites as the blacks, and broken as many imprisoning creeds and false dogmas as it has prison-bars and dungeon-gates.

## ART. IV.—RELIGIOUS TENDENCIES IN THE UNITED STATES.

*An Address read before the Ministerial Conference, May 25, 1869.*  
By A. D. MAYO.

A FEW months ago, one of the most cultivated, religious, and truly venerable of the judges of the courts of the United States said to a Unitarian clergyman: "*This country is now passing through a religious revolution, no less decisive in its character than the great social and political revolution through which we have lately passed.*" It was more than a happy illustration that coupled the religious and political state of our nation in this remark. In a country where thought is free and all human institutions are perpetually reconstructed by the will of the people, we can never understand the drift of one, without careful comparison with all. Our industrial, intellectual, social, political affairs are surging along the same channels as our turbid religious life. Indeed, all these tendencies are the natural outcome of the actual religious faith or unbelief of the American people. In revolutionary periods, like the present, the political life of the country is the best mirror in which its religious life can be reflected. Looking into that national mirror, we plainly see three political tendencies, so decisively marked that they cast all others into subordinate shadow. The political turmoil of the war has now subsided, leaving these three tendencies so distinctly defined that there can be little hope of their extinction or union.

First, we see in every community an increasing class, who believe republican institutions and government a failure. Differing in many questions of detail, not yet thoroughly organized for political action, cutting across the lines of the great rival parties, this class is a unit in its out-and-out denial of the principle of equality of human rights, on which our whole political system is founded. It believes in the government of the whole people by an aristocracy, and confident-

ly anticipates the day when the Republic will fly to this, as the only refuge from unbearable anarchy.

At the opposite pole of our political life, is a vast, unorganized body of citizens of foreign and native birth, who assert the almost complete right of the individual against all government, order and law. In the continued ravings of that class of suppressed rebels, North and South, who went to war to vindicate individual, plantation, and State rights, against governmental order itself; in the defiant attitude of large numbers of workmen, of several occupations, who assert rights utterly impossible in any peaceable community; in the scandalous prostitution of judicial power to shield the vilest criminals; in the wholesale and blatant corruption that threatens every region of municipal, State, and national government; in a general spirit of brutality that has more than once risen in appalling strife, to trample out civilized society itself, we behold the gathering together of this organization of anarchy.

Both these tendencies are in the field as national agitators; and, while they confine their operations to agitation, and violation of law and order, they assume fearful proportions, and overwhelm the patriot with apprehensions for the future. But whenever the whole people is aroused to some great expression of its convictions on one of the test questions of national life, both instantly subside into secondary and sometimes contemptible positions. Then comes up that wonderful, compact, and many-sided manhood, which has made the Germanic, British, and American people, the guardians of the most sacred interests of humanity and a progressive civilization. You never know a North German, Englishman, Scotchman, or an American sprung of these antecedents, as long as you judge him by his speech or opinions, or even conduct, under the ordinary circumstances of life. While they are going smoothly, even until the decisive hour in a revolution, he is a creature proverbially self-asserting, obstinate, disputatious, given to provoking controversy, and playing with startling theories on the most sacred themes. But when the mighty question fairly confronts him, this spiritual drapery falls, as the fantastic cloud-world above the Vale of Chamouni dissolves;

and he stands in his peerless, practical manhood, the Mont Blanc of all orders of men.

In the most disheartening years of our past struggle, the whole American people has always struck the keynote of faith in a republican order of society, and a civilization safely and surely advancing towards the emancipation and exaltation of man and society. The leaders of despotism and the leaders of anarchy learn, to their amazement, that when the people is brought to the ballot-box, or Congress brought to a national emergency, men do not act logically, or consistently with previous opinions or words. They elect Lincoln; they do not impeach Johnson; they rally upon Grant; they keep the peace with foreign nations defiant alike of the logic of Mill, or the rhetoric of Sumner. They do not confess that as men, acting in critical national emergencies, they are bound by previous speculations or speeches which only represent the intellectual faculties of their manhood. This great, overpowering majority of the American people can be intrusted with the cause of a progressive civilization towards the summit of the golden rule; for any organized party that proposes despotism or anarchy will be powerless to hold its own followers when this mighty standard is lifted up as the signal to the solid, realizing manhood of the American Republic.

It needs but moderate observation to behold the same tendencies to despotism, anarchy, and a progressive Christian faith, in the present religious mind of our land.

Never has the claim of a despotic, infallible priesthood to govern the religious affairs of the American people been more distinctly put forth and vigorously pushed than to-day. To a certain order of the clerical mind, this pretension of a divine calling and election to rule God's heritage comes with a fatal charm. So much is it a matter of spiritual constitution, that no liberality of creed can greatly modify it; while the most stringent dogmas and extravagant ceremonies are oftenest its offspring. It is the great aggressive power in the Catholic Church; and even American Episcopacy is more vitally touched by it than it cares to confess. It breeds constant war in the great Methodist, Presbyterian, and Congregational Ortho-

dox bodies ; and most of their bitter dissensions are the result of an untamable lust of spiritual dominion in a small but implacable division of their ministry. And no man has lived through the last twenty years of Liberal Christianity, radicalism, materialistic atheism, even the most extreme forms of religious or anti-religious agitation, without recognizing this old Devil of priestly assumption of infallibility, masquerading under every disguise of humanity, spirituality, scepticism, or outright mockery of religion itself. It is never an easy thing for a strong man to become the venerated spiritual adviser and guide of men, without falling into the insane fancy that to him has been given, in some peculiar way, the keys of heaven and hell ; and whatever fine logical or sentimental names our divinity students inscribe on their new banners, as they issue upon the world, their hardest fight will always be against this terrible old roaring lion of priestly arrogance, and blasphemous assumption of power to bind and loose the souls of their fellow-men. Through all the denominations of American religion, we see this order of priestly men, drawing near to one another ; and with no formal co-operation, nay, often unconscious of their own tendencies, they have become a formidable power in the country.

Equally well defined is the opposite tendency to that exclusive individuality in religion, whose last results are social and religious anarchy. Perhaps there was never so large a proportion of the American people as now, who honestly believe that religion is a strictly private affair, with which no outside influence should presume to intermeddle. Each man is a universe in himself, solely capable of recognizing or repudiating a Creator, a code of morals, a career in life. The very yearning for spiritual communion to such a mind is a temptation to be resisted. The claim of society for religious example or activity is scornfully repelled. All the ordinary modes of promoting religious fellowship or organizing Christian work are rejected, as an intrusion upon the sanctity of the individual realm, where alone divinity is enshrined.

This excessive tendency to individualism in religion is often found in connection with a traditional faith in Christianity ;

or it may be loosely held as a mental theory, while the deep places of the nature are consecrated by a profound life in God and humanity. In transitional periods, we must not hold men severely to logical systems of belief. Many a sincere disciple of this habit of thought and life would feel shocked and insulted, on being held responsible for the inevitable results of his own darling speculative and personal preferences. We do not judge the religious or Christian character of men in this essay, or assume to hold the balance between conflicting tendencies in the same mind ; but we believe the final outcome of this whole ideal of excessive individualism in religious thought and practice, in our own and other Christian denominations is self-deification ; and out of this spring flows selfishness in morals, solitude in faith, and the severance of the lateral arteries through which courses that life-blood which makes all men "members of one body." Indeed, this form of religion is essential paganism ; the opposite pole of the Christianity of Jesus, whose law is universal love and the union of all created beings in one family, bound up in Christ and God. In numberless forms does this new paganism confront us ; in the materialistic atheist, making his own senses the god of his life ; in the student who enthrones the logical intellect, and worships his own mental processes as the only deity ; in the airy sentimental, who follows the flitting gleam of his own moods with a fidelity worthy of a nobler religion ; in the artistic adorer of his own all-beautiful self as reflected in colossal proportions against the colored mist of his own imagination ; in the philanthropist, who lifts himself to the awful summit where all earthly institutions and men pass in endless review before his final bar of judgment,—a self-organized court of appeals for the universe ; in forms whose name is legion, does this American self-worship, the heathenism of the New Republic, prevail.

Every religious body holds a well-known party of its disciples, under the peculiar garb of its creed and ecclesiasticism, busily engaged in the work of disorganization. There is a destruction in religious affairs that comes from the irresistible might of a higher faith, whose end is the creation of "a new

heaven and a new earth." A freshet of love, surging out of the celestial realms, often carries off the works of generations of earthly policy, and strews an age with costly ruins; but only that the fair kingdom of God may appear in ampler boundaries on deeper soil. But this spirit of self-deification is essential disorganization; a dry-rot in the centre of the soul, that makes all human society impossible. Nothing can take root and grow on this blasted soil but pale and ghostly shadow-plants; mushroom theories that cover the ground in a night, and blacken when struck by the sun that wakes creation to life. The most brilliant man, once sequestered in this exhausted spiritual receiver, only spins round on his own axis, and finally goes off, through spiritual convulsions, into spiritual inanity. The most promising church, once seduced into this ethereal form, finds itself curtained off from our common humanity by a film too fine to be seen, too invincible to be rent, wherein it falls away into spiritual and moral languor, and dies so quietly that Christendom does not know when it breathes its last. This spirit is everywhere at work in American affairs, especially among the classes whose culture has just attained that perilous edge of magnificent self-consciousness, where it remains poised for evermore. But it rules in the densest realms of barbarism as well. Indeed, it is not a culture, but a diseased tendency of the manhood that underlies all culture and circumstances,—in a Comte or a cobbler, reducing the universe to the scenery of one all-comprehending self.

If we look at these two tendencies only as agitating forces in the country, we may easily, according to our style of temperament, fall into a panic, and believe the religion of America is ebbing toward Rome, or is wasting itself amid the barren sands of atheism. In the city of New York, a fervent Protestant minister can hardly resist the conviction that we are coming to be enclosed in an iron dynasty of priestly government. In the great cities of the West, it needs a mighty faith to overcome the apprehension that religion itself is passing out of the recognition of the people. But theological estimates of such a people as ours are rarely correct, since they deal chiefly with creeds, theories, and words, and

rarely descend to the deeps of the individual or national character. The American people is, perhaps, the most undemonstrative race on earth, as far as concerns the outward expression of its real faith. It exercises the national privilege of personal independence and boundless talk, up to the extreme verge of actual peril to the practical religion of the land. But when this crisis appears, the manhood and womanhood that have slept so long in the background rise with a majesty that dwarfs the whole theoretical and rhetorical demonstrations of the past. This sudden change does not mean that these people have fallen away from an advanced principle into compromise with despotism, and treason to spiritual freedom. When occasion demands, they will die for this: but now, something is to be done of great use to man in his present state; and the American people has not reached that sublimity of self-abnegation that it will dissolve human society, or annihilate the Church of Christ, to vindicate its perfect logical consistency to a theory of the millennium.

So, when there comes a period of reconstruction in the church, like that since the war in the United States, the people, as represented by the practical, influential majority, survey the ground, estimate the elements already at hand, cast a hopeful glance towards the future, and begin to combine and consolidate, through all the churches, for a great tendency to a powerful, healthy, working Christianity. We are sometimes told, that the most striking thing in the popular churches is their falling away from the old theologies. Doubtless, there is a vast theological fermentation through the whole region of our ecclesiastical life. But we shall greatly mistake, if we regard this as more than a negative phenomenon. The most important fact in our present church life, and one fraught with untold blessings to our country, is the closing up of the masses of Christian people to make the church of Christ a mighty, progressive, religious, and philanthropic power in the national life of the future. This fusillade of theological controversy is only the encounter of the flitting cloud of skirmishers; sometimes nothing better than the pranks of a

squad of ecclesiastical "bummers;" while the great army of a redeeming Christianity, organized in powerful divisions, led by veteran commanders, moves like a providence from the valleys to the sea,—terrible only to the foes of man, a redeeming angel to all who lie in the prison-camps of sin and the dungeons of unbelief.

Contemplate the tremendous forces represented during the last two weeks' review of the religious and philanthropic bodies of the country. From the Catholics to the Hebrews, every denomination furnishes an eager, influential party, that drives at a practical American form of the religion of Jesus Christ. The Episcopal Church (least American of any composed of native-born people) is silently gathering its energies for the trial that awaits it; and when the day of schism is precipitated by its High Churchmen, the vast majority of its moderate clergy and laity will be found in possession of the organization, ready to offer the hand of fellowship to the progressive Christianity of the land. While the smaller clerical lights of the Methodist Church are wrangling over the admission of lay representation in the Conferences, the powerful laymen of that vast denomination have virtually taken possession of the whole concern, by the weight of money, social and civic influence and personal character, leading the really influential preachers and bishops in the road to progress. They are filling the land with costly churches, and doing a work of social and spiritual regeneration, incomprehensible to a mere student of philosophical theology. The Presbyterian Churches, always in Europe the vanguard of civil and religious reform, are drawing nearer one another, not to fashion a new catechism, but to help the New Republic towards a higher religious life. The Congregational bodies, Calvinistic and Baptist, were never so vigorous and rapidly increasing in numbers and the efficiency that rejoices all good men. The Liberal Christian Churches, Unitarian, Universalist, "Christian" of both divisions, are full of a new life; and that life is on the same plane as the bodies already described. The Reformed Hebrews, Theists, Spiritualists, religious reformers and agitators of every epoch, are compelled more and more

to forget their criticism and protests, to meet the calls of a kind of work that is drifting them towards a practical Christianity. *For the drift through all these powerful organizations that contain the people who saved the country and will govern it, is not towards a philanthropy that ignores God and Christ and the gospel of love; but towards the highest form of Christianity represented by the person, gospel, and life of Jesus Christ.*

It may be said, that thousands of the people engaged in these church movements are not in sympathy with their creeds and forms. But here is the very point of the matter: *This great, united, progressive, Christian tendency is the real Church, including all these creeds, forms, divisions, marchings, and countermarchings.* It is everywhere felt that only secondary men are absorbed to-day in criticism, the splicing out of creeds, and ecclesiastical upholstering. The people who will rule every division of the grand army of the Lord in the United States of America, are not greatly interested in these theological or ecclesiastical questions, but are toiling among their fellows to awaken the new flame of hopeful consecration and thoughtful love, which alone can bear them through the great days before us. We perpetually underrate the effects of a Christian public spirit in lifting masses of men out of the little cells of their private conceits, and inspiring them with a burning zeal in a good cause. Individualism in religion says, "Let each man cultivate himself, alone, up to the heights of manhood, and then all will be well." Christianity says, "You can never become a man at all, until you forget your individuality in the glorious sense of brotherhood to man, discipleship of Christ, and sonship to God; and, lifted upon the rising tide of a providential public opinion, sweep on to the conquest of error and sin, and the exaltation of holiness and truth."

Here, indeed, is the peculiar method by which the religion of Christ has changed the civilized world. Paganism can boast its lofty group of marvellous men, worthy to be enrolled among the chosen of the race; and it is easy to cull from their lofty words maxims that do not contradict, yea, often confirm, the sayings of Christ. But the Christian religion,

first of all, professed to regenerate individuals by bringing them into the inspiring atmosphere of a refreshing public opinion. It appealed to the social, civil, family instincts of men; set before them not an alien God, but a Saviour, at once the companion of Deity and the brother of every soul; and a spirit of self-sacrifice for the common good, whose symbol is the cross. It does not go about cultivating exotic and rare specimens of sainthood, but awakes such a marvellous enthusiasm in communities, peoples, nations, that every man is compelled to respect the right, and is lifted off his feet, spite of the gravitation of his elegant or vulgar selfishness. All the great reformations of Christianity have come from this rising tide of an inspired public opinion, which floated off great minds that otherwise would have lain stranded for life on the sand-bars of private conceit or degrading sins. If we wait till every soul is a saint, we shall never get any thing good. God's mighty works are achieved by inspiring vast masses of very ordinary people, and hurling them, like the incoming of the Atlantic surge, right against some obstinate wrong. It is just in this way, that the mass of American Christians, in all the great denominations, are being inspired with a new zeal for a vital Christian religion, deep and simple and obstinate and practical enough to fight the combined armies of despotism, anarchy, and sin.

This growing Christian public opinion, which is uniting and fusing all the progressive elements in every church, is, of course, felt most strongly in those parts of the country where Christian influences have longest prevailed, and society is most homogeneous. It is a great mistake to speak of the West as the land of religious liberty, in contrast to New England. The force of a Christianized public opinion is incomparably stronger in the East, than the West. It compels sceptical and wicked men to conform to a civilization higher than themselves. It supplies the conditions of a speedy and safe moral judgment on private character or public affairs. It makes the great religious bodies ashamed and afraid of bigotry, and perpetually draws together the most vital elements of a practical, spiritual, progressive religion. The West is still a country

where settlement has far outstripped civilization, in the sense of the organization of a sensitive, elevated, Christian public spirit. It has already produced, and is producing, individual men and women whom the country delights to lift to the highest posts of honor, especially in industrial, military, and civic affairs. But it is a land, too, where great bad men can do untold mischief; where any folly, eccentricity, rascality, if it only be strong and shrewd enough, can get on its legs, assail and insult the most sacred faith and institutions, vilify the noblest men, and keep its ground till a slow and uncertain public opinion can be rallied with prodigious effort to cast it down. So religious exclusiveness and bigotry reign there with a brutality and violence scarcely to be conceived until experienced; while multitudes of people, held in their Eastern associations by the pressure of a Christian civilization, fall below their higher selves on coming to us, and forget all for which they were most esteemed in their old home. Yet even in the West, especially the North-West, where society is more united under the leading influence of the New-England and New-York mind, the same tendency appears; although Catholicism and copperhead Episcopacy rear their heads in insolent pretension in these cities, and every form of scepticism, even to a scoffing atheism, desolates the land. Yet every church is alive with the gathering together of the American brotherhood of religion, which, with faith in God and man, under the banner of Christ the Lord, is marching on to possess the country, and slowly lift it to that only civilization which can insure the life of the Republic.

The formal union of the really Christian bodies or people of the United States comes slowly. The people in all the churches who feel this inspiration are multiplying occasions to unite with one another in all semi-religious work, and they drag along these huge, ungainly ecclesiasticisms faster than such machinery was ever trundled before. All changes in creeds or organizations are in the interest of union and liberty. The Young Men's Christian Association is becoming a new church, including the most vital elements of all the old churches of orthodox proclivities; and already the more

reactionary clergy distrust and try to suppress its influence. Were it clearly understood that the National Conference of Unitarian and other Christian Churches could hold itself firmly planted on its present most catholic platform ever yet attained by a Christian body, and would not be coaxed or forced off into an ignoring of the Christian religion in any form, we should behold a facing towards it from all quarters of the land, by all the friends of progressive Christianity. If that goes by in some gush of amiable optimism, its place will be taken instantly by a new set of men, perchance less gifted with mental wealth and refinement and a morbid conscience, but with broader shoulders, better spines, and more stalwart limbs, able to "fight it out on the line" of a religion that beholds in the faith of Christ the uttermost liberty consistent with a manhood consecrated to the immutable verities of the eternal life.

Unless all the present signs are delusive, the most vital elements in all the Christian bodies of the United States are now tending towards a virtual union of religious life in a not far-distant future. What are to be the principles of that American form of the church of Jesus Christ?

1. It will be a church founded on a *religion*. High Church ecclesiasticism centres on the authority of a class of men to represent God to the world,—a pretension essentially secular. Individualism in religion centres on a worship of self, in which there is no religion. There can be no genuine religious faith until the soul has given itself away in self-surrender and perpetual sacrifice to the one infinite love; to man, the child of God; to truth and duty. Its very essence is the going out in quest of something grander than self; and the new tendency in the churches is all in that direction. It is utterly vain to attempt to move this great country by any power that begins and ends in a self-evolved speculation or morality. What can a young man do with such a creed in a great Western city,—a seething multitude of all the races, tribes, and tongues on earth, in every state of brutality, ignorance, vice, up to the loftiest intelligence and virtue; unfused, often with hardly a common idea of life on which to

stand together, with sensuality, dishonesty, public crime and social infidelity weltering in a chaos all about him? Can any little philosophy of life, spun out of a student's brain or adopted from an admired leader, make an impression on that crowd, arrest it, and lift it up to newness of spiritual life? Every preacher of such a type utterly fails among us, and finally comes back to dwell under the shadow of the critical schools, or falls away into a secular occupation. Our people recognize the real quality of manhood. They admire intellectual dexterity and appreciate learning, and are curious to hear all the new things under the sun. But they give their hearts and confidence only to the man who comes in the strength of self-forgetfulness, and takes hold on the deep faiths that underlie their noisy, superficial activities. It is these few quiet, patient, all-enduring, and ever-toiling people, that are slowly fashioning that civilization to which we all aspire. America cannot live on a mental or moral philosophy, a science, a sentimentalism, or any thing less mighty and all-embracing than a religion; and towards the Christian religion of love to God and man the best mind and heart and hand of the country are tending, beneath the upper conflict of theologies and forms.

2. This religion must propose the ideal liberty of perfect love, and in all its theories and phases recognize the law of progress. Perfect freedom there cannot be till the coming of perfect love. Wherever sin and selfishness—however refined or pretentious—prevail, is bondage under any creed. Religious freedom is not possible to a priesthood imprisoned in the conceit of infallibility, or to a soul that cannot flow out in an all-comprehending reverence and love for that which is above itself. Isolation from the church and Christianity is not necessarily liberty; it may be a sentencing to the gloomiest dungeon of a mind content with itself and incapable of breaking the chain of its own petty conceit. The way to freedom in American religion lies not in the path of every will-o'-wisp of private speculation, but in the track of inspiration for the union of all good men in a consecration to God and man; and this religion bears and forbears with the narrow-

ness and infirmity of real men, glad to secure any vantage-ground of practical deliverance from old prejudice, content to lead men as fast as they can safely be led up to those airy heights where only a soul filled with truth and holiness can abide. The idea that any freedom is really gained faster than men grow into the manhood of which Jesus Christ is the type, is a fallacy very captivating to certain orders of minds, but exploded by every new experience of human life.

3. And this religion of love, in its progress to liberty, always centres on a personal faith in God, in man, in Christ, as the best historical and ideal representative of both. Impersonal religion is a thing often praised, but so rarely seen that it may well be reckoned among the fancies of mankind. There are plenty of people who have dispensed with a personal God and Saviour, and suppose themselves founded upon a lofty idea; yet any wise observer can see they have only cast out the highest personalities from their society to follow some leader of the hour, or perhaps the most unreliable of all leaders,—their infallible self. When we begin to make creeds about that personality in God and Christ which can become the centre of such a union, we fall into intellectual confusion and spiritual distraction; and why should we be surprised at this? Is any great and good man the same to any two of his lovers? Does not every soul that follows him build up an ideal man upon the corner-stone of his character and life, perchance assailable to criticism at every point? Do not the estimates of all his friends differ so curiously, that it can be proved by logical process that the existence of his personality is a myth? And yet does all this affect the real man? There he stands to be revered and followed by every loving spirit, the strongest bond of union to multitudes of people who, but for him, would have dwelt for ever apart. So does the glorious personality of the Christ attract, charm, inspire, and bring together in sublime accord all the families of the earth; and in this New Republic, where races hitherto only tied together by force and fraud must live in the harmony of equal rights, what power less potent than that matchless divine manhood of his can bring men of every clime, of opposing orders of

mind, of hostile temperament, together into the unity of spirit in the bond of peace? To say that a religion which casts out that personality can lift up and unite such a mass of contending peoples, is to repudiate all the experience of men. The American people followed Washington and Lincoln through the two revolutions that landed them on the shore of civil liberty. Every church in America is built around a group of saintly men. The religion that can save us now will centre upon that Christ the Lord, who never was defined aright, who has been expelled from existence or deposed from his offices in every age, but who abides to-day,—yea, to-day seems first emerging in his real glory from out the cloudland of the creeds, in full sight of all mankind.

4. And this religion must be an organized church of Christ to unite the people in saving the New Republic. A man who cannot work religiously with other men either lingers in the pettiness of the first, or is declining into the decrepitude of the second, childhood. Our individuality is the lower side of our manhood; and no man dreams of what he really is capable till he feels himself a wave leaping up to the sun with the whole ocean of humanity thrilling the very spray that fringes its edge. That church which obstinately holds aloof from the best attainable fellowship bears the seed of death in its bosom, or lives at all only by the privilege of an active fellowship it perpetually disowns. These sects, like the Friends and the Swedenborgians, that draw off in dainty separation from the best religious life of their age and time, may be praised in literature, but are out of account in the forces that move the world. It is high time that American Unitarianism should choose its destiny in this regard; for only that section of it will abide which is able to offer practical, organized, working fellowship to all of Christendom that will gather about a Christian religion of liberty and love and increasing service of God and man.

Such we believe the American Church of Christ will be,—the church that shall finally include the people who are the responsible supporters of our American order of society, its defenders in peril, its protectors in peace. And into that

church will come all religious men who are not smitten with the insanity of spiritual dominion, or paralyzed with the cold palsy of the adoration of self. All of the High Church in whom self-sacrificing love overpowers the lust of power will come, bringing the best of their symbolism, which is the type of the union of all men to Christ and God. All of the radical schools will come, in whom self-sacrificing love for any thing higher than self at last prevails. There will be left an aristocracy of despotic priests, and a guild of philosophers and *savans* in whom the literary and scientific tendency has conquered the religious life ; and they will only be left out because they will not come in. But as the years go on, and our national life evolves in grander relations to the life of mankind, it will be more profoundly realized that only one central force can hold us united, and shape all our diversities into graceful variations on the themes of liberty and order, love and law. Blessed be God that we can prophesy this new coming of Christ, with no reservation for ourselves; ready to be taken up just as we are by the incoming wave, and mingled with the mighty waters that shall ebb and flow around the earth till this world shall be called the Kingdom of Heaven.

---

#### ART. V.—DR. NOYES'S TRANSLATION OF THE NEW TESTAMENT.

*The New Testament* : Translated from the Greek Text of Tischendorf.  
By GEORGE R. NOYES, D.D. Boston : American Unitarian Association. 1869.

THE Common Version of the New Testament, it is well known, is, in the main, a revision of Tyndale's translation, the first edition of which was published in 1525. "The peculiar genius which breathes through it," says Froude, "the mingled tenderness and majesty, the Saxon simplicity, the preternatural grandeur, bear the impress of one man,— William Tyndale. . . . Lying, while engaged in that great office, under the

shadow of death, he worked under circumstances alone, perhaps, truly worthy of the task which was laid upon him; his spirit, as it were, divorced from the world, moved in a purer element than common air."

The translation of the New Testament by Dr. Noyes, conceived and executed in the spirit of Tyndale, was passing through the press, when its author, who had long been lying under death's shadow, was called to higher scenes. "The old house," he used to say, playfully alluding to his enfeebled body, "is out of repair, and the Owner is not pleased to put it in order again." But the mind was clear to the last; and, in the work before us, we have the crowning labor of his life, — the Testament he so much loved faithfully translated according to "the universally acknowledged principles of scientific interpretation," yet suffused by a tender and holy light, such as shines only from a heart set on the things above and not on things on the earth.

Of this translation, it is not too much to say, that the labors of the most eminent biblical scholars of this century in textual criticism and scripture interpretation have been laid under contribution to make a work worthy in all respects of the age in which it appears: the writings of critics, commentators, translators, and theologians of every creed and church, have been freely consulted; and to this extensive, we had almost said exhaustive, research, combined with the translator's own thorough and varied scholarship, the Christian world is indebted for an English version of the New Testament, which in most, if not all, points of comparison, we do not hesitate to pronounce superior to any which has preceded it.

Aside from its great merits as an exact translation of the best Greek text, Dr. Noyes's version is specially characterized by the uniform excellence of its English. To translate the Bible into any modern tongue requires in the translator an adequate knowledge of Hebrew and Greek, and a clear insight into the peculiar genius of these languages as employed by the writers of the various books. But the English Bible is a constituent and important part of English literature.

There is a "spirit and savor" in the language of the old and familiar version which English readers are not willing to lose, and which, in any new version that is to be widely and permanently read, will never be sacrificed, except to the paramount demand of fidelity to the original. Tyndale's translation, which furnished the basis, and in great measure the substance, of our Common Version, decided not for his day only, but for our own time as well, that the style of the English Bible should be popular, and not literary; its language, the English spoken and understood by the common people. In the translation before us, both the simplicity and the strength of diction which the translators of King James inherited from Tyndale are retained. While Dr. Noyes has restored in many places shades of meaning which the wear and tear of generations had well-nigh obliterated; has brought to light threads of thought and subtle lines of feeling, which, in the Common Version, are wholly concealed; and has even corrected the pattern itself, wherever through ignorance of the true text or mistakes of interpretation it had been altered from the original,—he has yet preserved, with an exactness which is truly remarkable in view of the numerous changes which he has made, the web and woof of the version endeared to English minds by long and constant use.

But we pass from these *prolegomena* to consider the translation itself. The principal arguments which for a long time have been urged in favor of a new and thorough revision of the English New Testament are: first, the mistranslation of many words and phrases in the Common Version; second, the changes which have taken place in our language since the days of King James; and, third, the possession by modern scholars of a Greek text far more accurate and trustworthy than that of the imperfect editions used by Tyndale and the translators of the authorized or common version. Many of the differences between this version and the translation by Dr. Noyes are due to the text of Tischendorf, which he has invariably followed; and while the common reader will be likely to judge unfavorably of certain renderings in the New Translation, from ignorance of these variations in the text,

it is equally necessary that those who are students of the *Greek* Testament should keep this fact constantly in mind. The most important of these various readings, relating to controverted passages, are well known to biblical students; and such works as Mr. Norton's "Statement of Reasons," Mr. Abbot's edition of the Memoir of the Controversy respecting 1 John v. 7, as well as most of the recent Commentaries on the New Testament, give ample information on these points to the general reader.

In adopting Tischendorf's reading of John i. 18, *μονογενὴς θεός*, Dr. Noyes merely adhered to the rule which he had laid down in his preface, not to interpose his own judgment concerning any of the various readings of the Greek text. Had he followed that reading which he himself regarded as the true one, the translation of the Common Version, "only begotten Son," would have been retained. In his *eighth* critical edition (of which the portion that includes this passage was published after Dr. Noyes's death), Tischendorf restores the old reading *ὁ μονογενὴς υἱός*, — thus confirming by his later decision the judgment which Dr. Noyes had before given concerning the correct reading.

The mistranslations in the Common Version of disputed passages relating to theological doctrine have been corrected by Dr. Noyes, yet in such a manner as to leave no just ground of complaint on the part of those who would prefer a different rendering. The famous passage in Romans ix. 5, is given as an ascription to God, and not, as our Common Version has it, a description of Christ. But in a note the ambiguity of the punctuation is conceded, and the possibility of the old translation freely admitted.

The incorrectness of the authorized version in Philippians ii. 6 has been generally conceded by competent scholars. Dr. Noyes's rendering is substantially the same as Alford's; but the whole passage is far more intelligibly translated, and is one of the many places wherein the superiority of the version before us over other English translations is clearly seen.

But the advantage which the readers of Dr. Noyes's translation enjoy in having the true Greek text restored, and the

obscurity and inaccuracy of disputed passages removed, is only a small part of their indebtedness to the labors of this most careful and thorough scholar. As Dean Alford has forcibly remarked in an article on New Testament revision, "It is not too much to say that all the finer characteristics which give life and spirit to the Gospel narratives, all those features which could bring out to the intelligent student the attitude and motive of the persons engaged, are lost in the carelessness or clumsiness of our much vaunted translation."

In a great number of passages, both in the Gospels and in the Epistles, these last features have been fully restored by Dr. Noyes. Not only has he given a correct rendering of the tenses of the Greek verb, whose exact force in numerous instances our Common Version wholly misses, and most modern revisions have but partially restored: he has also brought to light the precise meanings of many Greek words which Tyndale and the translators of King James mistook, and which, in our Common Version, are in different places represented by different English expressions; has carefully distinguished the various uses of the Greek article, pronouns, and particles; and has given accurate translations of Hebraisms and other peculiarities in the idiom of the New Testament Greek. While in this version we find no *interpretations* in place of translations,—such, for example, as Mr. Norton's rendering of Matt. v. 3: "Blessed are they *who feel their spiritual wants*,"—we are constantly surprised by the clear elucidation given to some hitherto obscure passage by a rendering for the first time of the full force of the original.\* In so far as a translation may legitimately serve as a commentary, by putting the English reader on the same vantage-ground with those who read and understand the Greek, the version of Dr. Noyes has a marked superiority, not only over the Common Version, but also over the various revisions of that version, with which it challenges comparison.

But perhaps the greatest merit of the work before us is to

---

\* Compare, e.g., Matt. vi. 22, 23 in Dr. Noyes's Translation with the same passage in the Common Version.

be found in the clearness and force of the language into which the translation has been made. The majority of modern English versions of the New Testament,—indeed, we may fairly say, all such versions without exception,—however successful they may be in other respects, have failed in this. We can learn something from almost any of them in regard to the real meaning of words and expressions which, in the Common Version, are obscurely or inaccurately rendered. But the *English dress* in which these translations have been given is often distasteful alike to the common and the cultivated reader, and not infrequently is positively offensive to the lover of a pure and strong diction.

To have preserved throughout the integrity of the Common Version would have defeated one of the most obvious purposes for which a revision was needed; viz., to give an English translation which, so far as the language alone is concerned, would require no explanation to make its meaning plain. Yet the English dress in which Dr. Noyes's Translation appears is not the exclusively modern style which certain translators and revisers have adopted. Not to speak of the absurd and often ludicrous expressions which abound in such works as Harwood's "Literal Translation of the New Testament," and the version of the Gospels by Dr. Campbell, whose "*Rhetoric*" was far better in theory than in this application of it, or that astounding performance the "*Elegant Version*, by the Rev. Rodolphus Dickinson,"—the modernisms of style in the versions of Sawyer and Folsom, and even the much better English of Mr. Norton's Translation, are hardly to be preferred in many passages to the familiar language of the Common Version.

We are not pleasantly impressed, when Paul in his vision cries out to Jesus, "*Who are you, Lord?*" Nor is the manner in which the priests and Levites accost the Baptist in Mr. Norton's Translation any more agreeable. "*Are you Elijah? Are you the prophet. . . . Who, then, are you?*" The old and solemn form of address, "*Who art thou?*" which in both places Dr. Noyes retains from the Common Version, is more in keeping with the occasions on which the words were originally

spoken. This may seem to be a small matter in so great an undertaking as a revision of the English New Testament. But it is in the rare good taste which Dr. Noyes everywhere displays in correcting or retaining the archaic and obsolescent expressions of the Common Version, not less than in the eminent Greek scholarship to which every page of the translation bears witness, that we see the marked superiority of the present version over all other attempts which have been made in the same direction.

Many of the felicitous expressions in Dr. Noyes's Translation are not original with him, but may be found in one or another of the previous revisions. The influence of Mr. Norton's Translation can be traced in many admirable renderings. A few expressions which are peculiarly clear and forcible seem to have been taken from Green's "Twofold New Testament," a translation into what might be called ultra Saxonism of diction. Yet no lover of a pure and dignified style would be satisfied with a single chapter of the "Twofold New Testament;" while for correct and idiomatic English, Dr. Noyes's Translation is incomparably superior to such an eccentric production; and the same may be said with equal or greater force with regard to other modern English versions, which Dr. Noyes has followed in certain passages, where, in his judgment, they give a clear and accurate rendering of the original. No one of all these translations is, *as a whole*, so free from objection on the score of its English, or gives such unalloyed enjoyment to the reader from the simplicity and purity of the style, as the version of Dr. Noyes. Other revisers and translators have been valued contributors to his work; but the uniform excellence of the translation is due to the superior judgment and good taste which enabled Dr. Noyes to keep clear of old errors and archaic English, and yet not run aground on a style too exclusively modern.

To criticise, in some minor particulars, a work to which we have awarded such high praise, may seem presumptuous. Indeed, we are frank to acknowledge, that in all the passages which we have examined, where objection may be taken to the rendering of Dr. Noyes, we have found that the trans-

lation which he has given is based on a full knowledge of all the difficulties in the case. The question is not in any instance, Is the translation wrong? but, Is it the best possible? And it may well be that any substitute or alternative which can be proposed will be more objectionable than the rendering itself. We venture, however, to offer the following suggestions in reference to a few passages, claiming for them no more weight than they are fairly entitled to, as slight criticisms upon an almost faultless performance.

In Luke viii. 23, for the somewhat antiquated expression "*in jeopardy*," we should prefer the modern equivalent "*in peril*," which in 1 Cor. xv. 20 Dr. Noyes gives as translation of the same Greek verb.

In Col. iv. 8, we should translate *παρακαλεῖν*, *strengthen* or *encourage*. Dr. Noyes translates this verb "*encourage*" in the second verse of the second chapter of the same Epistle. The reason for this change from the "*comfort*" of the common is equally valid in both places, and is based on the fact that the English verb *to comfort* has, in modern usage, lost its original and old-English sense (from *con* and *fortis*) of strengthening or encouraging.

In Luke xviii. 3, the phrase, "*avenge me of my adversary*" is objectionable, as being an obsolete form of expression. Mr. Norton translates, "*Do me justice against my adversary*."

In Luke ii. 48, Dr. Noyes has rendered *τέκνον*, *son*, instead of the correct word, *child*. This translation is unaccountable in a version where the distinction between *νιός* and *τέκνον*, which the old translators so often confounded, is in most other places carefully noted.

The literal rendering of John vii. 17, is, *If any one wills to do his will* (not *if any one will do it*, as in the Common Version). If objection be taken to this translation on the ground of euphony, its equivalent would seem to be, "*If any one has the purpose*," &c., and not as Dr. Noyes gives it, "*If any one is desirous*," &c.

In Luke xviii. 42, Dr. Noyes has rendered *η πίστις σου σέσωκε σε*, "*Thy faith hath saved thee*;" while in Luke xvii. 19, the same words are translated, "*Thy faith hath made thee*

well." The explanation of this difference in the rendering of the two passages by the distinction between leprosy, a disease, and blindness, a calamity, is hardly to the point. The objection to the expression, "hath saved thee," is the unavoidable association of the word "saved" with the doctrine of "salvation through Christ." Perhaps Mr. Folsom's translation in both passages, "Thy faith hath *restored* thee," is the best that can be substituted.

In John viii. 35, *δοῦλος* is rendered by an unusual word, "bond-servant;" while in 1 Cor. vii. 21, and elsewhere, it is translated, *slave*. The passage in John would be more forcibly rendered by using there the word *slave*,—a term which has become so familiar to all English readers by a thousand painful associations.

In Romans vii. 2, the Greek verb *καταλογεῖν*, which is used by the New Testament writers with a great many shades of meaning, is translated *release*; while in the sixth verse of the same chapter, it is rendered *deliver*, where the word *release*, employed in v. 2, is decidedly to be preferred.

In Col. i. 13, Dr. Noyes translates *τοῦ νιοῦ τῆς ἀγάπης αὐτοῦ* "of his beloved son," where we should prefer the more literal—i.e., word-for-word—rendering "of the son of his love" (Wycliffe had it "the son of his loving").

In Matt. xxviii. 14, *ἐὰν ἀκονσθῇ τοῦτο ἐπὶ τοῦ ἡγεμόνος* is rendered by Dr. Noyes, "Should the governor *hear of this*." (The Common Version has, "If this come to the governor's ears.") But the phrase evidently denotes a legal hearing (so Meyer *in loco*), and would seem to require the translation, "If this *come before* the governor."

In Mark vi. 20, the Greek imperfect *συνετίθει*, which, in the Common Version, is translated *observed* (the verb to observe having its *old-English* sense), Dr. Noyes renders *was regardful* (so Green, in the "Twofold New Testament"). But the meaning of the passage seems to be, that Herod kept John in close custody, in order to protect him against Herodias. (Wycliffe translates, *and kepte him*.) Mr. Folsom's translation, *guarded him closely*, is nearer the meaning of the Greek than *was regardful*, which is, besides, not a very good English phrase in such a connection.

In Matt. vi. 1, instead of the word *righteousness*, which as the translation of  $\deltaικαιοσύνη$  takes the place of the incorrect *alms* of the Common Version, we should prefer the translation, *good deeds*, which Mr. Norton gives. *To do one's righteousness* is not so good English, nor does it so well suit the context, as to do one's righteous, or good, deeds.

The difficult passage at the close of the second chapter of Colossians (verses 20-23) is well rendered by Dr. Noyes; but we agree with Mr. Abbot in thinking that the last clause of verse 23 is to be taken in a bad sense. To express this meaning, it would be necessary merely to insert a comma after the word "honor," and thus preserve the nervous, asyndetic character of the original.

One other instance, where the use of different words in the same chapter to translate the same Greek word seems to have been an oversight on the part of Dr. Noyes, has been pointed out in another Review, and deserves notice here. The passage occurs in the fourth and fifth chapters of Romans, in which the substantive  $\piαράπτωμα$ , rendered *trespass* in iv. 25, is translated *transgression*, and also *offence* in v. 15, *offence* in v. 16, and *trespass* again in verses 17, 18, and 20.

We have thus indicated some of the revisions of passages and single words in Dr. Noyes's Translation, which an examination of certain parts of the work has suggested. Doubtless other desirable changes will be proposed by other readers who shall make a more thorough study of the whole work.

But such criticisms do not detract in the least from the eminent merits, the great and almost incomparable excellence over other modern translations, by which, *as a whole*, this Version of Dr. Noyes is characterized.

We have no space for noting the numerous passages which we had marked as displaying Dr. Noyes's erudition as a biblical scholar, his judgment and good taste as a translator, and his absolute impartiality as a critic and theologian. The changes from the Common Version in the Synoptic Gospels will perhaps attract most attention from the common reader. But those who *study* the New Testament, whether in English or in Greek, will derive the greatest assistance from the clear translation of the Fourth Gospel, so much of which is obscure

in the Common Version; and the rendering into intelligible English of the Epistles, whose meaning the old translators not only often missed, but oftener still expressed in language which the English reader is sorely puzzled to apprehend.

The Proem to the Fourth Gospel in Dr. Noyes's Version seems to us a masterpiece of translation. Let any one who would see how far Dr. Noyes excels all other revisers of the Common Version, both in knowledge of the original and in judgment in translating, compare the first chapter of John in this version with the *perversions* which some of the older Unitarians offered for translations, with the rendering in Mr. Folsom's recent translation of the Gospels, with the *quasi* revisions which the "Five Clergymen of the English Church" and the "American Bible Union" have made in the interests of Orthodoxy, or even with so excellent a translation as that of Professor Norton.

The Epistle to the Romans in Dr. Noyes's Translation is another signal instance of the great excellence of the work. If Dr. Noyes had translated nothing else in the New Testament, his admirable rendering of this grand Epistle of Paul would entitle him to the gratitude alike of the common reader and the biblical student.

We cannot close our extended but too meagre notice of this great work of Dr. Noyes, without a word of praise to that careful and thorough scholar, Mr. Ezra Abbot, to whose constant co-operation and assistance the translator owed many valuable criticisms and suggestions, and to whose conscientious fidelity and accuracy, as an editor, all readers of the work are largely indebted.

The times are hopeful for an appreciative reception of a revised version of the New Testament, containing so many and such great merits as the translation which these eminent scholars have given to the world. If it be too much to expect that the authorized version, with its numerous grammatical inaccuracies, its obsolete or obsolescent words and phrases, its acknowledged mistranslations, its frequent departures from what is now the received Greek text, its absurd division of chapters into verses alone, without regard to paragraphs, its unnecessary use of italics, and its constant abuse

of marginal references,— will soon be superseded by a version free from errors of scholarship and violations of good taste; it is at least safe to predict that, with all unprejudiced and competent judges, the translation by Dr. Noyes will take at once a high place, if not indeed the very highest, among all existing revisions of the Common Version.

Perhaps the day is not far distant when it shall serve as the basis and pattern for a new translation, to become the Common Version of all English-speaking Protestants; just as the authorized version of King James's translators was based and fashioned upon the great work which was accomplished for his day, alone and single-handed, by William Tyndale, in the spirit of whose labors Dr. Noyes has so faithfully and successfully worked.

---

#### ART. VI.— SPANISH ORIENTALISMS COMPARED WITH SCRIPTURE.

*Poesias de Don MANUEL JOSE QUINTANA.* *Obras Poeticas de Don JOSE DE ESPRONCEDA.* *Poesias de Doña CAROLINA CORONADO DE PERRY.*

WE do not propose to make any review of the poems of the above-named writers; but merely to present a few parallels to the strong, highly colored language of nature, which we find not only in the Old Testament, but also in the New, and which has given rise to much scepticism in regard to the good faith of the authors, or to their freedom from self-delusion.

Quintana, in his grand poem, "To the Sea," says, "The sands tremble beneath the lashing of its surges; the echoes are deafened in the hoarse tumult; the mighty hills are quaking." Espronceda, in a war-cry to the nation in 1835, cries, "The enemy are lost! abundant rivers of infidel blood rush to the sea with mighty roar, and the astonished ocean looks upon its contending waves reddened with the blood of traitors."

But the best illustration of our thought we find in a poem of Carolina Coronado de Perry, addressed to Maximilian, not long after his death at the hands of the Mexican people. We see at the outset that the writer, living in a land of kings, looks upon his death with a kind of awe and horror, which could not have been aroused in us, accustomed as we are to the barbarities and lawlessness of South-American and Mexican warfare; but one can hardly help being carried along by the intensity of the poet's feeling as he reads. The poem is nervous, full of fire, and grand in its culmination. But we are not dealing with it now as a work of art, but are merely looking at it from one point of view.

After opening with a cry of mourning for the horror-struck world, whose kings stand aghast at the awful spectacle, and whose senates start up affrighted before the bolt which has descended upon the Western Continent, she goes on to speak of the contest for freedom which was waging in Mexico, and which was suddenly brought to an end by the arrival of the French fleet. She speaks of President Lincoln as looking with severe eyes upon the squadron approaching, and with profound pity on Maximilian. We quote the Spanish of three verses, and the translation which we have made, especially referring to the last verse, where in grand language she depicts the effect of Lincoln's protest upon the Mexican world.

Lincoln, el Patriarca Americano,  
Vió allá en el Oceano  
De aquellas naves los pendones rojos :  
Y su frente serena  
Anublando la pena ;  
Volvió hacia ti los lastimados ojos.  
Mártir cual tú, con tierna simpatia,  
Tu suerte presentia,  
Y alzando sobre el mar la voz tonante,  
Con el lábio seguro,  
Os hizo su conjuro,  
Desde el seno de Méjico al Atlante.  
Las tumbas de los Reyes mejicanos  
Se abrieron en las llanas ;  
Tornóse el golfo de color sangriento,  
Y en la Iglesia cristiana  
La piedra castellana,  
Al resonar su voz tembló, en su asiento.

Lincoln, the patriarch of America the free,  
Looked there upon the sea,  
Looked on those ships with scarlet pennons blazing :  
His countenance serene  
Darkened before that scene ;  
He turned to thee with eyes of pity gazing.  
Martyr as thou, with sympathy for thee,  
He saw what was to be ;  
And sending on the waves his voice astounding,  
With accents firm and staid,  
His grand protest he made,  
From Mexico unto the Atlantic sounding.  
The tombs that bore the Aztec kings' remains  
Opened along the plains ;  
The gulf became with bloody waters darkened ;  
The stones imbedded fast  
In churches long to last,  
Shook in their seats when to his voice they harkened.

Here is a Spanish woman of a clear head, of a cultivated understanding, not dwarfed by the habit of thought among the rest of her sex in Spain, accustomed to use her pen, who tells us without any qualification of, "It seemed to me," or "I imagine," — who tells us, in a moment of poetic exaltation, as if she were stating a fact, that the tombs of the Mexican kings opened on the plains, the gulf of Mexico ran blood, and the solid stones in the churches shook in their places at the sound of Abraham Lincoln's voice.

She does not use this high coloring merely by way of illustration, in the form of allegory or visions, metaphors or similes : that would of course excite no surprise, as all florid writers of the present day make abundant use of these accompaniments to fine writing. She states things as facts which we know are not facts, not with deliberate conscientiousness, but under strong poetic emotion. She afterwards, in the cooler moments of elaborating her poetic thought, apparently sees no reason from over-conscientiousness in regard to the truth, to alter her lines. Now we neither consider her self-deceived nor desirous to deceive others. The reader may say, "Very well, her poem is of no value in an historical point of view." Not as far as the mere dry statement of facts is concerned, we answer. If it were, she would not be the poet that she is. But if something else is needed even in

history, besides a bald record of facts, if we need to have events brought before us in a graphic manner ; then we maintain that her poem is of value from that point of view. We need the warm colors of the poet and painter to touch up events, and present them vividly before our eyes and imagination. All great historians have something of these elements in them, although the limits of their domain forbid that they should give too much flight to imagination.

A dull painstaking historian, who moves along in his own little path with narrow vision, is really more likely to mislead posterity, by his stupid distortion of facts, than the seer, who sees perhaps farther than we can follow, but who glorifies all that we actually do see, and know of truth.

We have in the Scriptures numerous examples, in the way of narrations, prophecies, or lamentations, like what we see in this poem. They are more frequent in the Old Testament ; but, as they do not so much concern great moral questions, we turn to the New.

Not to the Book of Revelation, for that is manifestly allegoric,—a vision, typical of the Christian warfare which had been and was to be, and the final rest of the conqueror. Nor to the words of Paul, when he speaks of the Lord descending with the sound of a trumpet, and the dead being raised, while they who were alive would be caught up together in the air, to be with the Lord. He was not, we suppose, in any special state of exaltation when he wrote those words in letters to his friends : they actually formed a part of his belief. He was, in minor matters, affected by the prevailing notions of his day : it does not alter our regard for, or reliance on him, as a great religious teacher ; he was not infallible, but he never makes mistakes on great themes which concern our highest spiritual welfare. We might indeed mention his doctrinal expositions, remote as the parallel may seem, as illustrations of what we see in the poem, where the intensity of his earnestness presses him so far one way that he outsays himself, and sometimes seems for the moment to belie his own liberality, so much, that very narrow creeds have been founded on his noble name.

But we wish to compare the words of Jesus himself with

this poem we have quoted. The prediction in regard to the destruction of Jerusalem seems in many respects to resemble the verses of our Spanish poet. After a moving delineation of the scenes which would be enacted, when there should be wars and pestilence and famine and earthquakes, he says, "After the tribulation of those days the sun shall be darkened, and the moon shall not give her light, and the stars shall fall from heaven, and the powers of the heaven shall be shaken." We know that those last-named events did not happen at the time of the destruction of Jerusalem. Many indeed suppose that these prophecies refer also to the end of life for every human soul. It is true that all the teachings of Jesus admit a wider application than came home to the experiences of his disciples; but it is great spiritual truths which reach down to us from his walks and talks in Judea, and not the fitting of local facts or phenomena to our own age.

The main facts of this prediction were fulfilled. Here steps in the critic, saying, "Precisely so. You have a mixture of truth and error. How is humanity going to draw the line with such a teacher? Call him fallible, and we will then accept him for what he is worth, and no more." But can we fairly use the word error in this case? However divine we may feel Christ's credentials to be, we must remember that he was born into the world with an oriental nature. God chose to send a divine (not omnipotent) being to our poor humanity, the man Christ Jesus. He chose the soil of Judea for his human existence. Would he not have been a monstrosity if he had shown no traces of his own nationality? When we come to truth itself, supreme truth,— who so clear, so bare, so cutting, as Jesus in his utterances? Although he often veils the processes of human growth, temptation, and triumph, in parables, to win and charm the childlike and ingenuous mind, and alike to discourage the overtures of the frivolous and hypocritical; yet when he has a plain, grand truth to utter, who so simple, so unimpassioned, so serene, as he? But when he was carried away with the intensity of his emotion, he did not stop to measure his speech; he did not lay down treatises; he simply said what he had to say,

and said it in such a manner that the people exclaimed, "Never man spake like this man."

This chapter we have quoted cannot be said to concern great moral questions. It is local in its application, and the whole coloring is local.

In a moment of exceeding pity and sorrow for his race, he seems to see all the universe in sympathy with their fate, and speaks like David who saw the Lord "riding upon the wings of the wind," and "touching the hills till they smoked,"—like the prophets of his nation,—like those of similar habits of thought and expression in other countries, the parallelism of whose utterances with his it has been our purpose to indicate. The basis of all this remarkable prediction, however, is truth. He began calmly, and all that was necessary to be said for their safety, for warning and instruction, was said; and there was no misunderstanding on those points.

Why should we not use the same liberality in the judgment of this exalted being which we bestow upon the poetic and religious seers of our own day? Why should we consider him either as a conscious and amiable deceiver, according to M. Renan, or as self-deluded?

It is the talk of our day that we should read the Bible as we do any other book. That is precisely what many of our advanced thinkers do not do. They manifest a literalness in their spirit of interpretation, which, in the department of *belle-lettres* or philosophy, would, even according to their own judgment, set them down as dullards or bigots. One-half the fine taste, delicate perception, and generous freedom which they make use of in the sphere of æsthetics, or among the venerable religions of the pagans, would bring out the Jewish Scriptures in letters of light, wherein the Son of man should stand, the central figure, the culmination of the past, and the beautiful hope of the future.

It would be a fine thing if we could find a man of high culture, original thought, pure philanthropy, and of a tender religious nature without traditional prejudice, who had never seen the Bible, and mark how he would read it, and what he would say of it. We know as a fact, indeed, that the poet whom

we have quoted, Carolina Coronado, born a Roman Catholic, had never seen the Scriptures until the time of her marriage. She read them with the delighted surprise and *naïveté* of the child, and the earnestness and faith of the woman. This instance would not of course serve us in our argument, as her whole education was Christian, and she was already biassed in favor of the gospel narratives. It brings us back, however, to the subject, from which we have wandered somewhat. If some large-minded critic would spring up in Spain, and give us the results of a pure philosophical investigation, blended with the fervor of the Spanish imagination, working upon a soil where it is more at home than we, it would be a great addition to religious thought. It would, at least, be a valuable antidote to that Teutonic nicety of dissection which is not satisfied until it has cut every thing to pieces before it; but which, fortunately for the Christian world and its own perpetuity, knows how to fit the parts together again so well that it can start afresh on its career. Who knows but the Spanish race, so naturally devout, so pervaded with the ancient love of liberty, and now actually shaking off its civil and ecclesiastical fetters, may produce a class of thinkers who will freshen and enlarge the speculations of the religious world; and, with some measure of the oriental vision, look deeper into the mysteries of divine truth?

---

#### ART. VII.—ORIGIN AND CHARACTER OF MESSIANIC HOPES.

INVESTIGATION, if it could be carried far enough, would probably show that no people has been without its belief in some by-gone golden age, and its longings for the return of the Saturnian days in a future more or less remote. Such beliefs and expectations are, no doubt, more fully developed in the primitive races, among indigenous people, or those of whose immigration neither history nor tradition offer any sign, and still more especially among the nations of the East. Yet to the

stern and legal Roman also came thoughts of early times, than which no Hebrew's dream was more extravagant, or told a more generous tale of earth's spontaneous fruitage and the mingling of gods with men. And England, though still young, has her mythology hardly less beautiful than the ancient Greeks, her "tales of Arthur and his table round," which may give hope to many a simple soul in darksome mine or by the roaring loom, and whisper of a time when there shall be justice in the land in ears that have been dull to all of Bright's or Gladstone's eloquence.

The general notion of future prosperity and glory is oftenest the child of national or social egotism. The notion of special instrumentality and of a specific helper comes with the felt need, in the midst of adversity, in the failure of ordinary expedients. The general notion, on the contrary, seems to live most happily, and to flourish best, in the house of joy, in the prosperous times of the State. We did not hear so much about "Manifest Destiny" after the beginning of the late Rebellion as we did before. Now we hear more of it than ever. But there is an education by antagonism as well. Men hope the most when they have least reason to hope. Facts are suggestive of their opposites, and Hope may be the daughter of Despair. We know that when men are freezing, they dream of blazing hearths; and that when starving, they talk of feasts and spread imaginary tables. Adversity is the very nurse of prophecy in some form or other. In the troublous times which intervened between the death of Julius Cæsar and the end of the second triumvirate, prophets abounded as at no other time in the history of the Roman State. When Augustus had attained the position of sole emperor, he caused the books of more than two thousand of these prophets to be collected, and consigned them to the flames. It was three or four years later that Virgil sang,—

"Jam redit et Virgo, redeunt Saturnia regna:  
Jam nova progenies caelo demittitur alto."

In times of adversity, also, it would appear the hopes grow more extravagant; and then expression becomes more concrete.

Except in such vague and general desires for the welfare of their country as we find in the citizens of every nation in every time, we find nothing among the Hebrews in the shape of Messianic hopes before the time of David. But these desires are simply patriotic and have no special character. "The book of Genesis," says Westcott, "connects the promise of redemption with the narrative of the fall;" and refers us to the third chapter, fifteenth verse. But this is a road which leads to the absurdities of Tertullian and Justin Martyr. The promises introduced into the patriarchal covenant would prove little, were they shown to be Messianic beyond all doubt. For the Pentateuch was not written in the time of Abraham: its books, as well as the other sacred writings, were burned or dispersed during the captivity, and again during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes; and it is known that they were very carelessly transcribed.\* In view of these vicissitudes, it would not do to stake too much on isolated passages manifestly premature, as we should be obliged to consider these, allowing them to be Messianic. In such case, we should refer them to the time of transcription or compilation, rather than to the time of Abraham. The later Jews rejected the Messianic application of these passages (Gen. xii., xviii., and xxii.) as manifestly too liberal. But their opinion does not avail us, embittered as they were against foreign nations by their terrible adversities. The verdict of the impartial modern critic is worth much more; and Dr. Noyes, with many others, has decided against their Messianic character.

But a promise similar to the above-named is reiterated in the covenant form with David in Psalm lxxxix., "I have made a covenant with my chosen, I have sworn unto David, my servant. Thy seed will I establish for ever, and build up thy throne to all generations." The same promise receives the prophetic form in the well-known passage in Psalm lxxii., supposed to be addressed to Solomon. We may call these passages Messianic, as referring to a universal dominion to be brought about by the instrumentality of a specific Messiah.

---

\* Josephus's account of the Septuagint.

But the idea of such a Messiah came much later. Without allegorizing, it is impossible to find a reference to him in these psalms. It may be a question whether the promises in the patriarchal covenant are not shadows backward cast from these, which we regard as representative of the simplest form of the Hebrew's Messianic hopes. A slight expansion of this notion of universal dominion involves the *conversion* of the nations which should thus be subjugated. And so we find the earlier stages of the Messianic theory marked by a dogma that "the theocracy would eventually be consummated in a universal diffusion of the worship of Jehovah." "All the nations of the earth shall remember and turn unto the Lord, and all the families of the nations shall worship before thee." But this apparent liberality was sadly modified in the thought of after times. The enemies of Jehovah were still to be subjugated and to witness the glory of his people, and then were to be immediately destroyed. Nations which had not been openly hostile were to be the vine-dressers and husbandmen of their conquerors.

Under the prosperous reigns of David and his son Solomon, all of the Hebrew tribes were for the first and last time united into one people. Thus, the theocracy received the highest development of which it was capable. An ancient oracle had foretold the sovereignty of the Lion of Judah. And, now, after long interruption, that sovereignty was revived in the person of the shepherd king, whom *tradition* declared to be the lineal descendant from the patriarch of his tribe. I will not stop here to say how fully he must have realized an ideal already dimly floating through the Hebrew's brain, — how truly he must have seemed to them a man after God's own heart, since he so solemnly fulfilled the longings of their greatest prophet, whose subjective notions of God they had elevated into facts of objective revelation. The temple worship could not desire a truer friend ; the State, a more brave defender.

And then came the reign of Solomon. If the success of David in establishing unity and infusing patriotism had given form to a hope already slumbering in the most ambitious and

egotistic of all races, what wonder that the increasing glories of the kingdom under his son should have developed that hope to such an extent as to make it ever after the centre of their national thought? For the reign of Solomon was literally an age of gold. There was silver in Jerusalem, as stones, and cedars as sycamores. We note the confident tone of Psalm ii., which was probably written in consequence of insurrectionary cabals at the time of his accession. How must this conviction of the immeasurable superiority of the theocratic king over all possible combinations have been strengthened by each succeeding year of a reign so rich in the enjoyment of the fruits of past victory and the hope of future exaltation! On account of its triumphant tone, this psalm was at one time claimed by the Jews for their Messiah. But such interpretation became distasteful to them, in proportion as the followers of Jesus applied it to the Jewish cabals against their Master.

When we consider in what relation to Jehovah the Hebrew nation always imagined itself, we at once perceive an antecedent probability in favor of such expectations as marked its history. And a prosperous period, like that just now spoken of, would almost inevitably bring such thoughts to the surface. And, consequently, while from one end to the other of the book of Psalms there is not a single reference to a specific Messiah, the whole collection is marked by the most confident expectation of the ultimate and complete triumph of their national institutions, their extension throughout all lands, and their continuance till the end of time; and this expectation was the joint offspring of their theocratic constitution, and the fact of its astonishing though temporary success. For temporary it was and must have been, from the very nature of the political connection of the Hebrew tribes. They were not a union, but a confederacy, in which there was an unlimited right of secession; and so this wondrous hope which had been born in the home of luxury was nurtured in the dwelling of utter poverty and abasement. Internal dissensions arose, public spirit declined. The sources of Solomon's wealth were cut off, and the kingdoms of Judah

and Israel were hopelessly divided. But this hope remained. It was like a tree, planted by rivers of water, already so stout and strongly fixed that the rushing winds of disappointment and adversity did but make its roots strike deeper and its boughs extend. Everywhere disappointed in the present, what more natural than that the minds of these people should turn to the past, and, consoling themselves with the things which Moses prayed for and David realized, they should look to the future for a time that should eclipse all the hopes of the one and all of the attainments of the other? "Sheer madness," do we say? Not if Jehovah was the God of all the earth, and they his chosen people. As surely as these things were so, so surely he would deliver his people in the end and make their dominion coextensive with his own. This hope, which had been born of prosperity, "increased in fervor in proportion to the misfortunes of the people, and as the successive insults of Assyrian, Macedonian, or Roman, seemed to laugh to scorn all human probability of its accomplishment. The fund of Hebrew hope was as immeasurable as the power of the invisible Sovereign."

It is in the writings of the prophets that we first meet with references to a specific Messiah, through whose instrumentality, when the day of the Lord had passed, the kingdom of blessedness and prosperity should be ushered in. Extending, as these writings do, over a period of four or five hundred years, we should expect to find the views of their authors concerning that kingdom varying widely as determined by the circumstances under which they wrote, and by their particular cast of thought. With all, indeed, it was to be Jehovah's work; but this is the only point on which there is universal agreement, beyond the conviction of its certain coming and its wonderful grandeur and extent. Often it appears that the consummation is to be reached through the ministrations of the priest, judge, or prophet, acting in regular and ordinary ways. In many of the prophets there is no reference whatever to the accomplishment of the hope by a special Saviour. Neither Joel, Obadiah, Zephaniah, Nahum nor Habakkuk, connects that accomplishment with any dis-

tinct personality. The same might also be said of the last twenty-seven chapters in Isaiah, which might be called Messianic, as having reference to a triumphant future, though none whatever to an individual helper of their own people; and, of course, no other could be regarded as identical with the generally expected Messiah.

But it was in those degenerate days when Ahaz ruled over Judah, and, the Assyrians having swept away many of the Israelitish people, the remainder banded with the Syrians, and menaced the Holy City, that Isaiah and Micah uttered forth most clearly the promise of a definite deliverer. Even supposing that the famous passage in the ninth chapter of Isaiah, "For to us a child is born, to us a son is given, and the government shall be upon his shoulder,"—allowing this to refer to Hezekiah rather than to the Messiah, in accordance with the opinion of many learned critics,\* still the passage in the eleventh chapter is so remarkable, that it must at once have become the centre of Messianic thought, as now of criticism, in regard to this question. "Then shall spring forth a shoot from the stem of Jesse, and a sprout from his roots shall bear fruit. The spirit of Jehovah shall rest upon him; the spirit of wisdom and understanding; the spirit of counsel and might; the spirit of knowledge, and the fear of Jehovah."

As the remembrances of the glory of David's reign contributed more than any thing else to foster the hope which was born of the prosperity of that period and those immediately succeeding, it was most natural that the eyes of the prophet should be turned in the direction of *his* family, for the deliverer who was to restore, and grace with added splendor, the departed majesty of the state. In the whole circle of Messianic hopes, no feature recurs more constantly than this. From one passage in Ezekiel,† it has been inferred that the prophet expected David himself to return. "And David my servant shall be king over them, and they shall have one

---

\* Noyes, Ewald, Knobel, and Hitzig hold the contrary opinion.

† xxvii. 24.

shep herd ; they shall also walk in my judgments, and observe my statutes to do them." So in other places ;\* so in Hosea iii. 5. But no doubt the meaning is simply a Messiah of the Davidical type. The prophet Nathan had, in the most emphatic way, announced that God would assume a paternal relationship towards David and his seed. "My mercy shall not depart from him as I took it from Saul, whom I put away before thee. And thy house and thy kingdom shall be established for ever before thee : thy throne shall be established for ever."† Again and again this oracle is referred to in the Old Testament, which evidences how much importance was attached to it. Not only the writings of the prophets, but also the apocalyptic and talmudic writings witness that the thought of David and his family was bound up with the Messianic hopes. And to this, also, nearly every page of the Gospels furnishes some evidence.

Let us now briefly gather into one the various threads of prophetic thought as to the distinguishing traits of the Messianic kingdom. The children of Israel, wherever they may be wandering, shall be gathered into one joyful nation in the land of their fathers, and shall no more go out for ever ; and there shall no longer be division and enmity between Judah and Israel, no longer a North and South ; but the twelve tribes shall be one people, and Jerusalem shall be the centre of their life, and shall stand for ever in the pride of her conscious beauty. Hither every year shall all nations come to the feast of tabernacles, and join in the grand temple worship and in solemn prayer. There shall no longer be idols or idol-worship in all the land. All men shall worship Jehovah ; nor that only with fasting and sacrifice ; but with the worship of the heart ; and at length there shall be universal peace, and this shall extend even to the animal world. "Then ‡ shall the wolf dwell with the lamb, and the leopard shall lie down with the kid. The calf and the young lion and the fatling shall be together, and a little child shall lead them." Nor would nature remain unchanged through all these changes, nor

\* Ezek. xxxiv. 22, 23.

† 2 Sam. vii. 15, 16.

‡ Isa. xi. 6.

would the heavens be still. The stars would shine with fairer ray ; the light of the moon should be as the light of the sun, and the light of the sun should be sevenfold. And in these times, if ever, should the Christ appear, and, sitting on the throne of David, should "rule the earth with ancestral virtues."\* "He shall not judge by the sight of his eyes, nor decide by the hearing of his ears ; but with righteousness shall he judge the poor, and decide with equity for the afflicted of the people. He shall smite the earth with the rod of his mouth, with the breath of his lips shall he slay the wicked."

When we come to details, there is of course much variety, and sometimes contradiction, between the different prophets and different parts of the same. The Messiah is sometimes spoken of as the conqueror of Edom and Philistia, and sometimes of Assyria, but oftener as a Prince of Peace. But here we seem to have simply an earlier and later phase of his character. There was to be world-wide peace when the prowess of Judah had subdued all nations. Many of the prophecies represent his reign as undisturbed by foreign invasion ; in Ezekiel we have the invasion of Gog and Magog. According to some, his reign shall be eternal ; others speak of his successors. As to the time of the Messianic kingdom, the different writers are any thing but definite or concordant. With most, it is to follow a captivity which is not far in the future. In the captive prophets, it is to follow the return ; and the representations of it have a direct moral bearing, being intended to discourage the willingness to remain in captivity generally manifested. No doubt the marvellous insight of the earlier prophets had much to do with the predictions of bondage and restoration ; but farther than this the maxim of the preacher, "There is nothing new under the sun," was never a stranger to the Jewish philosophy. With the Rabbins it became a formal doctrine ; and they imagined that the future would be but a repetition of the past. It may be that this is characteristic of most prophetic writing. Thus Virgil in the Fourth Eclogue sings, —

---

\* Isa. xi.

“ Alter erit tum Tiphys, et altera quæ vehat Argo  
Delectos heroas ; erunt etiam altera bella,  
Atque iterum ad Trojam magnus mittetur Achilles.”

So it was most natural for the prophets to think that the second period of glory would be preceded by a second period of disaster, and the captivity in Egypt be matched by a second captivity in Egypt, or in the nations of the East. The prophecy of a captivity in Egypt is confined to Hosea and the elder Zechariah, and was never fulfilled. Ewald remarks that the future of Isaiah is seemingly divided into three stages: first, deliverance from the inconsiderate attack of the allied kings; second, severe suffering under an Assyrian captivity; third, a restoration by the Messiah.

But so far we have not touched, except by implication, upon one of the most important notions in this circle of Messianic thought. The notion is that of a purifying and probationary time. It is something about which one must say a great deal, or a very little: we choose the latter course.

How did this notion arise? Between the glorious fact of what this people had been, and the bright hope of what they were to be, lay the dark gulf of what they really were. And then the Hebrew had his dogma of retributive punishment, his “so much for so much;” his “What will you have?” “Quoth God, *Pay for it and take it.*” Put this and the previous thought together, and we have “The Day of the Lord.” What were this people in days of prophetism? Read the chapters of the first Isaiah, and see,—careless, disobedient, mean, degraded, sensual, oppressive, beastly. God would indeed save his people, but could the “Lord’s rest,” the joys of the Messianic kingdom, be for such as these? Surely they could not. They must be tried as the gold of the refiner, beaten upon the threshing-floors of God. This was the valley of affliction through which the nation must go, before it could stand upon the mountains of vision; this was the travailing of the woman with child. The imagery of terror is exhausted in depicting the horrors of this dreadful time. “On that day a man shall cast his idols of silver and his idols of gold to the moles and the bats, and enter into the clefts

of the rocks, and hide himself in the dust, for fear of the Lord, and for the glory of his majesty." The prophet summons every natural terror to his aid ; there should be drought, pestilence, famine, leprosy, the curse of wild beasts and of locusts ; and, what was worse than death or any pestilence, subjugation and a bondage, galling and ignominious, in the land of the alien. The moral earnestness of the prophet lends wings to his fancy ; for many of these curses are conditional, and can be avoided by timely reform ; and the prophet would not have them incurred from any injustice to their dreadfulness on his part.\*

But there came a time when that which they greatly feared came upon them, aye, and worse, if possible, — the miseries of Babylon. The prophecy and its fulfilment did their work almost too well ; and, had not God raised up the bravest singer that ever blessed a people, not even a remnant would have returned. But in the fulness of time, that singer came in the person of the unknown author of the latter part of Isaiah. "Comfort ye, comfort ye my people, saith your God; speak ye comfortably to Jerusalem, and declare to her that her warfare is accomplished, that her iniquity is pardoned ; for she hath received at the Lord's hand double for all her sins."† He bound up the wounds of a people smitten in every part. What word of comfort, joy, or promise, did he leave unspoken ? How grand was his prophecy ! So grand, alas ! it never was fulfilled.

In concluding this notice of the prophetic period, let us remark three things. First, the personal Messiah, though at times quite prominent, occupies a subordinate position. The *Messianic age* is the one great fact. Second, a spiritual or supernatural Messiah is nowhere hinted at. The contemplated mediation never exceeded the limits of human agency. This is true, even if we accept Isaiah ix. as Messianic. The expressions "Mighty God" and "Everlasting Father" offer no objection.‡ Third, the work of the Messiah was the re-estab-

\* Vide Dr. Noyes's Lectures on Prophecy.

† Isa. xl. 2.

‡ See Dr. Noyes's notes on the passage.

lishment of the theocratic kingdom, on the basis of the Mosaic code. There is not a whisper of distrust. The conversion of the heathen did not imply any thing like yielding, any thing like toleration.

But the Messianic hopes of the prophets were never realized. "The Day of the Lord" came and went, and there was no Messianic kingdom. Zerubbabel, who led back from Babylon the few who availed themselves of the privilege of return, was indeed hailed by Zechariah and Haggai as Messiah; but this was dreadful mockery.

We know little of what took place in the three following centuries. Such sufferings as make men curse God and pray for death must have been bound up in them. Weary with waiting, and sick with disappointment, this Messianic longing must have almost perished in the midst of them. *But it did not die.* At worst it slept: a dreadful nightmare sleep no doubt. But at the end of this time it awoke.

We proceed to consider the transition from the Messianic hopes of the Hebrew to the Apocalyptic beliefs of the Jew. Of course it did not take place in a day. The seeds of such transition were no doubt in the captivity itself. For, in the writings immediately subsequent, we see that the process of degeneration has already commenced. In Ezekiel, we have a doctrine of angels before unknown. We have also a Satan, "a Prince of evil." A weak symbolism usurps the place of loftier methods. In Zechariah we have none of that opposition to formalism which marked the elder prophecy; rather, the gems of that slavish method which ultimated in Talmudism itself. The character of the Apocryphal books is, for the most part, such as to shut out from them the consideration of the Messianic problem, or we might have in writings, what there must have been in thought,—a gradual development of the prophetic circle of Messianic ideas into the Apocalyptic beliefs which we encounter, for the first time, in the book of Daniel. At the time of its writing, the Jews were weighed down by the heaviest yoke they had borne since the earlier days of the captivity. The pious Jew was driven, by threatenings of the most terrible punishment, to do the things

which most his soul abhorred. He must work upon the sabbath, eat of swine's flesh, surrender circumcision.\* No doubt it was a laudable thing in the false Daniel to encourage the hearts of this stricken people; but had he offered his predictions on his own responsibility, his fate would not have differed from Cassandra's: he would have been cursed with the incredulity of his hearers. In looking about for some one through whose lips he should speak, he was most happy in choosing Daniel, whose name had been revered for many hundred years, whose firm adherence to his country's worship in the days of the captivity could not be forgotten. But, although there is much in the uncompromising tone of this patriotic composition which challenges our admiration, it is not difficult to perceive what an immense gulf yawns between it and the productions of the earlier prophets. The difference between Daniel and Isaiah, is the difference between Paul and Hermas. Prophecy has become prediction. The impulse to look beyond the horizon of the present is no longer justified by the moral purpose to which the knowledge of the future had once been applied. If the spiritual consciousness of the people justified such expression, that consciousness had become depraved. Let us note two or three peculiarities of the new phases of belief, for we have not time to do more.

First, and most important, the Messiah is no longer a descendant of David, no longer a man at all, but a superhuman being of the most exalted character. The Messiah of the prophets was to be born in Bethlehem; the Messiah of Daniel is to come in the clouds of heaven. Second, it may be possible that in the earlier prophets, we have only an *apparent* reference to universal dominion. Hyperbolical expression may account for the whole of it; and at any rate, if the idea is there, it is very general and indistinct. Not so in Daniel: four great monarchies are to pass away, and then Messiah shall come and establish a fifth, which shall be universal. Far less than in the elder prophets is this dominion to result from any recognition of the glory of Jehovah, and the beauty

---

\* In 175 B.C., in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes.

of his law. Third, the predictions in regard to time are much more definite. There is, indeed, an attempt at exact numerical prognostication. It would be tiresome to discuss this point more fully. The time for Messiah's coming was during the reign of Antiochus. Again, instead of the symbolic resurrection of Isaiah and Ezekiel, we have a resurrection which is literal beyond doubt. Can we account for any of these changes? Some are ready to account for them all by the supposed influence of Persian thought. This may go a great way, but does not seem sufficient. But such external influence as there was, must have been Persian rather than Grecian, Egyptian, or Babylonian, as Nicolas clearly shows. The Alexandrian tendency was plainly hostile to such imagery. The book of the Sibyl only shows that a Jew went to Alexandria with Eastern notions. During the captivity the antagonism was too strong for the *faithful* Jew at least, to adopt many Chaldaic views. He could not so well resist the insidious influences of a protracted intercourse with the Persian. From him, no doubt, came much of the form which these opinions assumed, and perhaps no little of their substance. "Change the names of the actors in this grand Magian drama," says Nicolas, "and you seem to read a Jewish *Apocalypse*." The fifth monarchy of Daniel is not unlike the fifth dynasty to be founded by the Persian liberator; nor his prince of evil heading the idolatrous enemies of Jehovah, unlike Ahriman, hurling the legions of darkness against Ormuzd, the prince of light. The thousand years of the Messiah are matched by the period which shall precede the coming of the Persian hero. Finally, in the eschatology of both, we have a resurrection of the dead, and the proclamation of a new law.

But without doubt the Jew would have had his *Apocalypse*, had he never come in contact with the Persian. His altered circumstances demanded change in almost every direction; and, to suit them, a modification of his Messianic views was in the highest degree necessary. In the first place, a supernatural Messiah was demanded by the apparent impossibility of relief through any human agency. A con-

stant tendency to literalize the figurative expressions of the prophets must have helped his view along. Such a tendency, by itself, would be sufficient to account for the change from the symbolic resurrection of Isaiah to the literal one of Daniel. The exclusive character of the book may be accounted for by the hatred which long oppression must have engendered. Again, it was not possible for the pious Jew to think that the prediction of an earlier prophet had altogether failed. Now, though his genius for criticism would hardly lead him to detect the intrinsic fallacy in Jeremiah's seventy years, still the events which followed the Restoration were any thing but such as were promised. Zerubbabel fell far short of the humblest Messianic standard; and, that the prophet's word might still be true, an arbitrary numerical arrangement was agreed upon, and the years became sabbatical weeks. Much of the arithmetic of Daniel and the other Apocalyptic writers is determined by the prevalent custom of assigning, for the duration of the world, a period analogous to that employed in its creation. This reckoning formed the basis of all the later Rabbinical and early Christian eschatologies. In the fifteenth chapter of Barnabas we read, "God made in six days the works of his hands. He finished them on the seventh day, and rested on the seventh day and sanctified it. Consider, my children, what is the meaning of 'He finished them in six days.' The meaning is this: that in six thousand years the Lord God will bring all things to an end; for with him one day is a thousand years," &c.

To a certain degree a prophecy like that of Daniel tends to fulfil itself. It was a brand in the midst of the dry stubble. The generous fire was kindled in the hearts of the heroic Maccabees, and through them in the hearts of the people; but how little of fulfilment was there in what they achieved! "The time and times and half a time" went by, nor yet the golden age began. Intervals of precarious independence indeed there were; but they ended in vassalage, even as they had begun.

The Apocalyptic writings, which succeed the book of Daniel, are variations of the same general type. What is now

the third book in the Sibylline collection seems to have been written in the early part of the Maccabean times. It does not differ from Daniel in its general conception, except as being more extravagant. Nothing can be more terrible than the period here which corresponds to the "day of the Lord" in the prophets. Pestilence and war shall spread over the world: the earth shall be neither ploughed nor sown, but shall be covered with the unburied dead. "Then shall God send forth from the sun a king who shall cause every land to cease from evil war, slaying some and fulfilling a faithful covenant with others." The House of David has, of course, no place in this conception, any more than in Daniel; and the notion of personal instrumentality is almost forgotten in the simple recollection of the theocracy. The Ahriman of the Persians takes more distinctive form as Beliai. "But when the threats of the mighty God draw near, a flaming power shall come in a billowy flood upon the earth, and consume Beliai, and all the haughty men who placed their trust in him. God shall roll the heaven as a book is rolled, and the whole spangled firmament shall fall on the glorious earth and ocean. . . . And no longer shall the laughing globes of the heavenly lights roll on. There shall be no night, no dawn, no many days of care."\*

It would seem that scarcely any epoch of importance in the history of this people was without its prophetic voice of warning or encouragement. Ever anew the dreadful hour came on, but with it came the man! Ever anew from out the ashes of their disappointment rose, Phoenix-like, the bird of Hope!

The alternations of joy and sorrow which marked the period of John Hyrcanus and his immediate successors find expression in the Apocalypse of Enoch. The hopes of the Palestinian Jews at this time were raised to the highest pitch by the successes of this leader, only to be shattered again in the tumult of conflicting sects, originating in the weak and criminal dispositions of those who followed him.

---

\* Vide Westcott's Introduction.

The Sibylline writer had contemplated the destruction of the Grecian empire, the rise of the Roman, and the destruction of that also, preparatory to the coming of the Messianic king. The writer of Enoch, on the contrary, ignores the Roman empire, and, with Daniel, regards Greece only as the centre of irreligious, secular power. The seventy years of Jeremiah, and the seventy sabbatical weeks of Daniel, are seventy shepherds; and again a mystical period of ten weeks. The supernatural character of the Messiah is, if possible, more strongly marked than in Daniel. "I saw," he says, "in heaven One, Ancient of Days, and his head was white as wool; and with him was another, whose countenance was as the appearance of a man, and full of grace like to one of the holy angels. And I asked one of the angels who went with me and showed me all hidden things, of that Son of Man, who he was, and whence he was, and wherefore he went with the Ancient of Days." Again, however, the Messiah is imaged forth as the "horn of a white bullock." If Hilgenfelt is right, this is the *only* Messianic passage in the original book. And all the beasts of the field, and all the birds of the air, feared this white bullock and worshipped him alway. "And I looked till all their races were changed, and they all became white bullocks." The character of this apocalypse seems more nearly allied to that of the Apocalypse in the New Testament than either of the others.

In the fourth book of Esdras, we have the final development of the Jewish Apocalypse. Its character is determined by the dreadful and humiliating circumstances of the time. It would almost seem that we might say of this with more truth than of Ecclesiastes, that "it is the saddest of all sad books." The reference to Cæsar's death is so distinct, that it must have been written after that event, and not far from the beginning of our era. At the risk of disturbing greatly the theories of Daniel and Enoch, the present writer finds himself compelled to fully recognize the influence of Rome. The Messianic kingdom is to be ushered in by the death of Augustus, who is to be destroyed by the Messiah in person. This is according to Hilgenfelt's interpre-

tation of the vision of the great eagle in the eleventh chapter. So, then, in the midst of his despairing, the seer is full of hope. But his hope has no basis or justification in any thing which his eyes can see. It rests upon nothing less than the conviction that, sooner or later, God will redeem his people. Another consequence of the disastrous character of the times is the stern exclusiveness which marks the composition. The blessings of the Messianic kingdom are to be for Jews alone. From the Talmud and other contemporary sources, it would appear that this spirit characterized all the thought of the time. "And how, O Lord, if the world be made for our sakes only, do we not possess an inheritance in the world? How long shall this endure?" And again, "The Most High hath made this world for many, but the world to come for few. There be many created, but few shall be saved. Therefore ask no more questions concerning the multitude that perish; rather inquire how the righteous shall be saved, whose the world is, and for whom the world is created." The conception of the Messiah is somewhat confused, and it is difficult to say how it compares with the types of Daniel and Enoch. The supernatural element is still strongly marked; but, whether consistently or not, his lineage is again traced back to David. He is no teacher of righteousness, no prince of peace. His reign is to be inaugurated by a period of ruthless devastation and slaughter. It shall continue for a period of four hundred years. "After these years shall my Son Christ die, and all that have breath; and the earth shall be turned into the old silence seven days, like as in the beginning, and no man shall remain. But at the end of that time there shall be a resurrection of the faithful."

The exegetic literature of these times does not add much to the clearness of our conception. The Septuagint may throw some light on the views of the time and place at which it was made, from the fact that scarcely any passage brings forward the person of the Messiah in stronger light than the original text; and in some places the original ambiguity between a race and a person is decided by the selection of the race as the source of the divine blessings. The targums,

next to the New Testament, furnish the best contemporary testimony to the character of the Messianic views of the period. That of Onkelos is exceedingly literal. He gives a Messianic turn to the passage in Jacob's blessing, and also to the prophecy of Balaam. The targum of John closely follows the Davidical type. The later targums on the Pentateuch are not so simple. Thus in Genesis iii. 15: "Then shall the serpent strive to sting him on the heel, but the sons of the woman shall secure their deliverance in *the heel of time*," the days of the Messiah. It is here, for the first time, that we have two distinct Messiahs; one the son of Ephraim, the other the son of David: we have the notion repeated in the targum on the Canticles. In Ecclesiastes, the day of the Messiah's coming is a mystery as the day of death, and who is he who shall discover it by wisdom? Although the Talmud was for the most part gathered in its present form a century or two later, it is generally agreed that its contents must, even before Christ, have formed the staple of learning in the Jewish schools. So, too, it must, more nearly than any thing else, have expressed the popular creed, unless we except with Westcott the Psalms of Solomon, in which the temporal and kingly character of the Messiah is strongly marked. In view of the slavish method of the Rabbinical interpretations, we should not expect from them any higher conception than we have already met. "Is it not written in the law," says one of these to his pupil, "that thou shalt meditate therein day and night? Whatever hour, therefore, thou canst find belonging neither to the day nor night, in that thou mayest study Grecian wisdom." And with the masses, though the words of the law were weighty and light, the words of the Scribes were all weighty. Weighty indeed! They were the most miserable travesties upon the sublimest and most sacred utterances of those who went before them. "Behold the bough bearing flowers, berries, and fruits together!" "Behold the hen who lays eggs daily!" These were Rabbinical arguments for supposing that in the Messianic kingdom women would bear children every day. From a similar extravagance arose the common form of oath, "If I lie, let me never eat of the wild ox."

For, at the banquet of the Messiah, the Leviathan, having been previously salted down by God for the good of the faithful, would first be served up; the Behemoth would form the second course; while the dessert would be composed of that fabulous bird which concealed the sun with her outspread wings, and with one of her eggs drowned sixty cities. No wonder that men said, "The world has lost her youth, and the times wax old!"

It is not likely that the popular notions were superior in any way to the grotesque exaggerations of the schools. The temporal and kingly Messianic type seems to have been the prevailing one through the whole of this period. The readiness with which the people hailed every insurrectionist that came, the tumult of acclaim which greeted John Hyrcanus and the victorious Maccabees, bear witness to this, as also the scanty and hesitating allegiance to our blessed Lord, and the sight of three hundred thousand, fired with fanatic hope and zeal, gathering around the standard of Barcochba, and hailing him as the Messiah, near the latter part of Hadrian's reign.

But there was a perfect Babel of beliefs everywhere, and no two men seem to have been agreed. Three distinct types there were, at least, in Judea,—the Mosaic, the Davidical, and the "Son of Man," and still another connected with the Logos doctrine among the Alexandrians. But seldom, if ever, do we find these types in either of the unmixed forms. Many, following Hillel, said there would be no Messiah; that the prophecy was already consummated. Many more, starting it may be from the reference in Daniel to a Messiah who should be cut off, held the notion of two Messiahs,—the first, suffering; the second, triumphant. That Elijah would precede his coming, by three days, was, certainly, not an uncommon opinion.

The expectation of the Messiah's *speedy* coming was almost universal. The mystic reckonings on the basis of seven or ten— one the cipher of creation, the other of the law— contributed to this. Ingenuity was exhausted in devising the conditions of the event: if two or three sabbaths should be

well observed ; if the nation would heartily repent for a day. But, at any rate, it could not long be stayed. "When you bury me," said a dying Jew, "put shoes on my feet and a staff in my hand, that I may be ready when Messiah cometh."

And now, from all that we have seen,—whether longing of patriarch, psalm of poet, hope of prophet, or apocalyptic vision,—how could Jesus of Nazareth extract the prophetic testimony of his official character and establish his Messiahship ? He could not. Where he could find one thing in favor, he could find a hundred things in opposition to, his claims. It was not from the Jewish Scriptures that Jesus discovered that he was the one as set forth by God for the falling and rising again of many in Israel. No doubt his lofty soul assimilated to itself every thing that was loftiest in the Messianic longing of the elder Scripture. In the subtilty and freedom of his spiritual eclecticism, one lofty aspiration would weigh more with him than a thousand prophecies of national prosperity and temporal salvation from the bond of the alien. Certainly, One such as he would not have gone to the lowest, but to the highest, in the past, for the criteria by which he could discover whether he was indeed the Son of God. But even then, if his self-election to the awful responsibilities of the Messianic office had depended wholly on the authority of Scripture or tradition, we can assure ourselves that he would never have made that election, and the hills of Judea would never have been the mountains of God. No second-hand command, or transmitted inspiration, could have driven him to the acceptance of this gigantic trust. If that inspiration taught him any thing, it was that he should be true to his own. If David had communed with God upon the star-lit hills, he did not see why he should not as well. Samuel and Isaiah and Jeremiah had heard God speaking to them in their souls. He listened if haply such things might be for him also ; nor yet in vain. His reverent ear could catch whole strains of music where they had heard but a confused murmur. And what they had seen through a glass darkly, he beheld with open vision. The same God that spoke to

them, spoke to him also, in tones he could not fail to understand. What wonder that, as he listened, his ear became heavy to every harsher sound! Cannot the voice of a friend drown the roar of the multitude? How much more must the voice of God in his soul have drowned the maddened tones of disappointment, the whispers of doubt and fear, the clamor for a conquering king! Had any prophet prophesied, had any dreamer dreamed, had any thinker thought, of a Messiah such as he? No! But should he be false to his own inspiration that he might be true to another man's?

We can but think that he had dreadful doubts sometimes. They confronted him by the Jordan; he wrestled with them in the wilderness. Times there were, no doubt, when his understanding put dreadful questions to his soul; times when he could almost say of God like one before him, "I will not make mention of him, nor speak any more in his name." But, as with that other, "the word in his heart was as a fire shut up in his bones; he was weary with forbearing, and he could not stay."

But once having heard in the depths of his own soul the call to a great work, it was inevitable that Jesus should identify this call with the Messianic expectation. An hour's perusal of the pages of Josephus will reveal to any one into what a distraught and agitated state of things Jesus was born. At such a time, what Jewish mother could have prayed at night without thinking that, perchance, it was the Christ-child that she pressed to her bosom? And what youth, whose soul was kindled with theocratic zeal or hatred of the oppressor, or with undefined longings for something better in himself and in the nation than had been yet attained, but must have felt that, perhaps, he and no other was God's chosen servant in the task of renovation and reform? Here, in the community, was the strangest, wildest, and most beautiful hope "for one who should redeem Israel;" and in the heart of Jesus was the call of God, and just in proportion as that call was felt to be imperative, must its object have been identified with the work assigned to the deliverer in the popular conception. To some extent, that conception may have been

modified in his personal thought; but could he have found no point of union between it and his own ideal, he must have condemned himself to silence and obscurity, still working on with Joseph at his carpentry, without even lifting up his voice in exhortation or stretching forth his hands to heal. If the ideal that floated over him had been of any humble sort, he might have worked it out in humble way, anxiously waiting for the Messiah's kingdom, but never longing for its mystic crown. But such it was not. Rather, it was so grand, that, with his antecedents, he must have stood condemned at the bar of his own conscience, had he attempted to realize it in some individual way. He did not covet the responsibilities of the Messianic work. With all the modesty of the truly great, he shrank from them, and fondly hoped that he might be a follower in the Baptist's train. But his was to be the baptism of the Holy Spirit and with fire.

If, from the beginning of his mission, he could have seen its end, surely, he would not have identified himself with the Messiah's task. But what reformer ever saw the end of his work from the beginning? Did not Cromwell and Luther stand appalled at their own work? God does not call men to do this or that, but to do something great and noble; and often, when it is finished, the work of their own hands surprises them, though it be but the embodiment of his perfect plan. "Why, seeing that times are not hidden from the Almighty, do they that know him, not see his days?" Why, if not that blindness to the future is an essential element in the successful working out of its great problem? And, after all, had not Jesus as good a right as any one to decide on the attributes of the true Messiah, and by them judge of his own fitness for the Messianic work. As it is from great artists that art gets its laws, is it not from great religious souls that religion borrows its ideals? And may it not be said of Jesus, that from him the Messianic ideal received its finishing touches, and in him it was grandly realized?

## ART. VII.—REVIEW OF CURRENT LITERATURE.

## THEOLOGY.

THOSE who have been drawn by Dr. Noyes's translation to a more careful study of the language of the Testament, and to feel an interest in the questions of text and interpretation which it brings up, will welcome the further help they will find in the handsome companion volume prepared by Mr. Folsom.\* His principles of translation differ sufficiently to give that part of his work a value of its own. Its style is a good deal more modern than the other,—with more, probably, to offend the feeling of those who prize the verbal associations they are wonted to, but for that reason more suggestive, often, to those who seek the sense behind the words. A translation, like our Common Version, which has been imbedded in the popular speech, and has colored all our religious phraseology, for nearly three hundred years, stands, in one sense, outside the range of criticism. It has to be assumed as a point of departure,—very much like an original classic, of which all modern versions are so many independent studies from different points of view. The great majority of the public will never care for a different “standard version” than the one they have got. Practically, the best way of dealing with a classic is to keep it, essentially, in the shape we have always known; and freshen it, not by altering that, but by accurate understanding of its points in detail. It is for the sake of the side-light they throw on the version already so familiar, that we feel most indebted to the new attempts at rendering,—not for the sake of the substitute they offer. And the existence of an excellent version, like that of Dr. Noyes, is a fresh reason for, not against, a similar study, by one who comes to the task with a purpose and training somewhat different.

The particular value of Mr. Folsom's volume, however, will be found not merely in his theory or his success as a translator; but, still more, in the independent material which he has combined with it. His introductory essay is admirable for the calm, modest, and

---

\* *The Four Gospels.* Translated from the Greek Text of Tischendorf. With the various readings of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Meyer, Alford, and others, and with Critical and Expository Notes. By NATHANIEL S. FOLSOM. Boston: A. Williams & Co.

devout manner in which he gives the motive and principle that have guided him in his work. His notes are — as his pupils of former years will testify — the fruit of much faithful and honest study: we have ourselves been witness of the anxious and unsparing fidelity with which he has given them their final revision in the troublesome and costly correction of his stereotype plates. And it is a service for which the student of the gospel record will especially thank him, that he has endeavored to set forth the cardinal points on which the interpretation of it turns, so as to take just the shape, in the common mind, that it has to the scholar who examines the critical editions for himself. His table of Various Readings, prepared with much care, will give an intelligent reader a better view of the real questions at issue than volumes of dissertation; and this alone will fully justify, to teachers or learners in our numerous Bible classes, the preparation of the volume.

Its reverent and devout tone of commentary give this book a further and special value to most of those likely to use it; while the great beauty of its typography, and its convenient size, make it more than usually pleasant to handle and to read.

No writer of the ancient time has been more underrated and more neglected, than the Alexandrine Philo. His method of allegorizing has fastened upon him a contempt which he does not fairly deserve. He is really a clear, strong, and direct narrator, more intelligible and more trustworthy than most of those who have undertaken to tell the events in which their passions were enlisted, and in which they bore active part. Josephus has always been the standard authority in the story of the wars and persecutions of the Jews. But it is now coming to be recognized that Josephus was not only a supple time-server in his management of affairs, but an unscrupulous manipulator of the facts in his history. As between the two, no candid student will hesitate to prefer Philo to Josephus, as more accurate, more impartial, and even more sagacious.

This neglect of Philo, however, has been more marked in France and in England than in Germany. Nearly a hundred years ago, Gottleber published his ingenious "Animadversions" on the "Legation" of Philo. In the year 1800 appeared the "Philonian Chrestomathy" of Dahl. It is fifty years since Denziger's "Dissertation on Philo's Philosophy and the Jewish School in Alexandria" threw new light on the origin of Christian orthodoxy. Scheffler's "Philonian Questions" treat of Jewish life and customs under the reign of the

later Ptolemies. Gfrörer discusses, in his two volumes upon Philo, the whole subject of the Alexandrine theology, and Daehne follows up this discussion more fully. In the last twenty years, there have been numerous articles in the German theological journals on this prolific theme.

M. Ferdinand Delaunay,\* whose works upon the "Acts of the Apostles" we have already noticed in this Review, has attempted to restore the honor of Philo in the land where the rights of Jews have been so fully recognized. His solid volume is one of the most interesting and welcome of the recent contributions to theological literature. His admirable translation of the two most valuable historical works of Philo, the book "Against Flaccus," and the "Legation to Caius," quite vindicates his praise of the Alexandrine scholar. He proposes in subsequent volumes to continue these translations, and add to the historical works the treatises of doctrine and exposition. It was a happy idea to begin with the works which every one can understand, and in which there is so little of fanciful speculation. Hardly any thing is here to show in Philo a mystic or a dreamer. It is a shrewd man of the world, a practical philosopher, as well as an ardent patriot, who discourses of men and things he knows.

A well-written life of Philo, and a comprehensive and graphic "Introduction" prepare the reader for the narrative of the translation. But Philo's style is so easy, and his material so well arranged, that the introduction, interesting as it is, was, after all, not necessary. Both together give us a picture under lights a little varied, of the Jews in the reign of the first Roman emperors,—their numbers, their influence, their business, their relations to the aristocracy and the people, their way of life, their religious and political place, their patience, their hope and their bigotry. This picture is not that which has been usually given in the histories. It is quite time that the old idea of the insignificance of the Jewish people to Pagan nations and rulers in the age of the Herods should be greatly modified, if not wholly reversed. The most recent researches of scholars seem to show that no foreign people had more influence upon Roman opinion and manners in the time of the first Cæsars, than this widely scattered race of Abraham. The dispersion of the Jews, which was finished when Titus destroyed the Temple, had been virtually accomplished some centuries earlier;

---

\* Philon D'Alexandrie, *Écrits Historiques, Influence, Luttes, et Persécutiōns des Juifs dans le Monde Romain.* Par FERDINAND DRLAUNAY, de Fontenay. Paris: Didier et Cie., 1867. 8vo. pp. xvi. 389.

and when Philo wrote, there were far more of his people speaking Greek than speaking the Syrian tongue, far more in the lands of Europe and Africa than in the small country of Palestine.

There are two interesting questions concerning Philo on which M. Delaunay gives a decided opinion, though he does not argue them at length. One is of Philo's conversion to Christianity, of which Eusebius has the legend. In the works of Philo we certainly find no evidence that he had any faith in Jesus, or, indeed, that he knew anything about Jesus. He had a doctrine of the Logos, very distinct and positive; but he does not, like the author of the fourth Gospel, identify the Logos with the Man of Nazareth. In the preface to his translation of Philo's work on the "Contemplative Life," this question will be thoroughly treated; and it will be shown that Philo was in no sense a Christian or an apologist for Christianity. He knew less about it than Josephus knew, or at any rate he said less about it.

The other question, if Philo was acquainted with Seneca, the Stoic philosopher, M. Delaunay decides affirmatively. When the father of Seneca was prefect of Egypt, the young student lived for some time in Alexandria; and from the letters that he wrote, it is evident that he had been drawn to some of the ascetic practices of the Jewish people. Philo was as well known in Alexandria as Sotion was. That Seneca says nothing of the one, while he praises the other, does not prove that he had no intercourse with Philo. Seneca was a prudent man; and it would not be prudent to confess acquaintance with the teacher of a false religion.

C. H. B.

THAT Seneca was an acquaintance of the Jew Philo, seems to M. Delaunay a reasonable conjecture. That the more famous Stoic Marcus Aurelius was the friend of the more famous Rabbi Jehuda, compiler of the Talmud of Jerusalem, seems to Herr Bodek a fact capable of absolute demonstration.\* The Talmud speaks of the intercourse of this great doctor of the synagogue, with an emperor, Antoninus by name. Now there were *seven* of that name: which of these is meant? On this question the authorities widely differ. The mediaeval writers are undecided between Antoninus Pius and Marcus Aurelius. Jost argues for Caracalla; Cassel for Heliogabalus; Graetz for Alexander Severus; Frankel for Lucius Verus; Sachs for

\* Marcus Aurelius Antoninus als Freund und Zeitgenosse des Rabbi Jehuda ha Nasi. Ein Beitrag zur Culturgeschichte von Dr. ARNOLD BODEK. Leipzig, 1868. 8vo. pp. x. 158.

some later emperor; Rapoport for Marcus Aurelius. Rapoport is the grandfather of Herr Bodek, and filial piety predisposes this Rabbi to accept a theory which careful criticism fully confirms. In the first place, he proves a negative for all the other theories, and shows that Antoninus cannot be meant. Then he establishes the possibility, on chronological grounds, that Marcus Aurelius could have had intercourse with the learned Jew; then the probability, and finally reduces it to moral certainty. The whole argument is a very nice piece of special pleading,—so nice that the reader almost doubts of the conclusion.

Herr Bodek attaches no value to the fanciful Rabbinical story, that the mother of Rabbi Judah came to Rome with her infant son, where she found refuge and protection in the house of the mother of Aurelius, exchanging with this noble matron the office of nurse, so that the two infants were foster-brethren, and friends from the cradle. He is contented to believe that the acquaintance began in the late visit of the Emperor to Syria, and that he sought out the famous scholar whose name of "Rabbi" was more than a formal title,—was an expression of the deepest love and reverence of his people. So much of the volume is taken up with proving the identity of the emperor and the fact that he and the Rabbi were contemporaries, that the more important matter of their intercourse is condensed into a short chapter. Indeed, the traditions of this intercourse are not very full. The conversations reported about prayer and the times for prayer, about the relations of soul and body, about the responsibility of men for their deeds, about the origin of life, and about the spiritual life, do not illustrate very well the difference between the Stoic and the Rabbinic theories. The emperor's questions are answered by the Rabbi in the genuine Jewish style of parable; and the analogies of these parables are not more conclusive as argument than most analogies. The whole sketch of their interviews is in outline rather than in relief and color. The Jew did not convert the heathen, in spite of the good-will which he won by his grave wisdom and his broad charity. Herr Bodek does not pretend that the Stoic was induced to modify any of his views about God and duty and destiny, by the communications of the Talmudic doctor. That letters passed between them afterwards, he has no doubt, or that the friendship continued to the death of the emperor.

In the meditations of M. Aurelius, sentences may be found which strongly resemble sentences in the Talmud; but this by no means

proves that the Jewish philosophy suggested them to the Roman Stoic. One of the fruitful discoveries of our time has been the identity of the aphorisms of religion in nations the most widely separated. Confucius in China, the books of the Brahmins, the Greek sages, the Roman moralists, the Hebrew Rabbins, all speak doctrines which Christians have fondly believed were peculiar to their own religion. The golden rule is not merely a rule of the gospel. It is the rule of natural ethics, a law which is taught by the light of every soul. Mr. Farrar, in his beautiful essays on the "Seekers after God," gladly confesses that men have found Christian truth in other ways than through the Christian story, and the saving grace in other ways than through the church confessions. He admits the Stoics into the heaven of the elect, and ranks Aurelius with the chosen saints. It is a little singular that the discussion, how far Seneca and Marcus Aurelius were influenced by or inclined to the Christianity of their time, should find a counterpart in the discussion, how far these same philosophers were influenced by or inclined to the Judaism of their time. Mr. Farrar gives no heed to the intercourse of Seneca with Philo, or of Aurelius with Rabbi Jehuda, while he notices the Christian relations of his heroes only to leave them outside of the Gospel. It is much more probable that the opinions of the synagogue had weight with the Stoics, than the opinions of the Nazarene. Marcus Aurelius persecuted the Christians, as even Mr. Farrar has sadly to confess. He cannot quite explain away this blot upon the fair fame of his hero, which remains as ineffaceable, if not as damning, as the murder of Servetus upon the fair fame of Calvin. But the Jews Marcus Aurelius did not persecute. He gave them privileges and favors, though they helped him by no miracle of a "thundering legion." In his time the race of Israel had peace and quietness; and only a reasonable gratitude refers this to the influence of the great Rabbi.

C. H. B.

#### HISTORY AND POLITICS.

A TREATISE upon constitutional law for the use of general students has been very much needed. Story and Duer both wrote especially for *law* students; and the number of years that have passed, and the important changes made in the Constitution and in its interpretation since their day, render their works hardly fitted to the needs of the present generation. Mr. Farrar's book,\* again, is interesting as

\* An Introduction to the Constitutional Law of the United States. Especially designed for students, general and professional. By JOHN NORTON POME-

marking the extreme reaction against the doctrine of State rights, resulting from the war, but can hardly be regarded as furnishing a sound basis of opinion for students. But Professor Pomeroy writes expressly for the use of college students, whose needs he understands from experience: his views are decided, but not extreme; and he has the power of presenting them in terse and forcible language, so that the student will feel at every step that he is in contact with a mind of masculine grasp and thorough training.

We have said that Mr. Pomeroy's views are just and moderate; and yet, on the great question of nationality, we do not altogether agree with him. His view may be briefly stated as follows: that the Declaration of Independence was a *national* act,—the colonies acting as a unit; and that subsequently, by a sort of usurpation, the several States possessed themselves of a factitious sovereignty, so that the establishment of a national government by the adoption of the Federal Constitution in 1787, was simply a return to the original status of 1776.

This theory appears to us rather as a device to escape from an unpalatable alternative, than a natural inference from the acknowledged facts in the case. Mr. Pomeroy says, p. 39, "Grant that in the beginning the several States were, in any true sense, independent sovereignties, and I see no escape from the extreme positions reached by Mr. Calhoun." But no proof is offered of the necessity of this conclusion, except the inherent right belonging to every independent nationality, "of supreme, continued self-existence." This right, he adds, "can only be destroyed by overwhelming opposing force; it cannot be permanently parted with by any constitution, treaty, league, or bargain." But surely this is begging the point at issue. Why cannot a State surrender its sovereignty by merging it into another? This is what the several United States appear to have done; but as this again is the point in dispute, we do not see at any rate how it can be denied that Scotland did it in the union with England. Even Mr. Pomeroy admits that the States *exercised* sovereignty under the Confederation, and parted with it under the Constitution; it appears to us that the State which exercises sovereignty, *is* sovereign to all intents and purposes.

To our mind a great part of the difficulty in this question arises

---

ROY, LL.D., Dean of the Law School, and GRISWOLD, Professor of Political Science in the University of New York; author of "An Introduction to Municipal Law." New York: published by Hurd & Houghton, Cambridge, Riverside Press, 1868. 8vo. pp. 549.

from a desire to find in the acts and expressions of that epoch as clear notions of the nature of the government framed as we possess at the present day, — a notion which the men of that time had neither the leisure nor the disposition to form. They were making history, not criticising it ; creating institutions, not defining them. They do not appear to have attempted any distinct statement of the nature of the new government. They did not look at the question as lawyers, who must reduce every thing to rule and precedent, but as statesmen who had a particular work to do, and set themselves about it without concerning themselves much with definitions. They even took pains to leave the written document, which was the only form of constitution which it was possible for them to adopt, as free to expand and develop as was possible in the nature of things.

Even if they had desired to reduce every thing to precise formula, it would have been impossible, situated as they were. At every moment of time, action was the one indispensable thing, and upon modes of action they could agree tolerably well ; but there was no time when their abstract views were not so at variance with each other that any attempt to bring them to absolute uniformity must have resulted in destroying what unity there was.

The first steps towards resistance and independence seem without doubt to have been taken by the individual colonies ; but when the Continental Congress was once established, it is true that it assumed extraordinary powers, and exercised almost absolute authority through the first years of the war. It unquestionably overstepped the strict limit of its delegated powers, and we see no reason why this should not be branded as usurpation, as well as the later powers of the Confederation ; but it was a usurpation rendered necessary by the exigencies of the time. The Declaration of Independence was made, as Mr. Pomeroy says, while these high sovereign powers were in the hands of the Congress ; but he omits to say, what we believe to have been the case, that the power of Congress itself was derived from the action of the individual colonies, acting together by agreement and concert of understanding, not as under any central authority. As we hold with our author in regard to the practical recognition of State rights under the Confederation, it is not necessary to follow him here. On the formation of the Constitution in 1787 again, we agree with him that a genuinely national government was the result ; but while he believes that this was the resumption of a suspended sovereignty, we believe that the sovereign States actually surrendered their sovereign-

ty, and merged it in that of the new government. Of course we can offer no argument for this except the facts themselves as admitted by both. The sovereignty was *actually* possessed by the States in 1787, and in 1789 had passed into the possession of the new government; seeing that this act was, *in all appearance*, a real transfer of sovereignty, we submit that the burden of proof is against those who deny that such a transfer could take place, and that it is incumbent on them to bring forward some more cogent argument than a mere assertion that it could not. The doctrine that the apparent sovereignty of the States was a sham, is merely an inference from this unproved assertion.

In these arguments, as well as in his strictures upon Austin's views in regard to the sovereignty in the United States, Professor Pomeroy appears to us to make the mistake of insisting upon a theoretical definition of sovereignty, rather than accepting it as a fact wherever it exists; as Austin, for instance, in speaking of the relation of Frederick the Great to the Imperial Government, remarks in support of his sovereignty: "Being in a habit of thrashing its armies, he was not in a habit of submission to his seeming feudal superior." (Vol. i. p. 212.) It is the bane of our American discussions of political science, that they almost universally base themselves on theoretical and natural rights, rather than on facts as they exist. In the case under discussion, we hold that the sovereignty was actually transferred more than once during the transition from the colonial to the federal government. Mr. Pomeroy holds that it was in abeyance during a considerable portion of this time.

To return to the Convention of 1787, it is very clear to one who attentively considers the relations of parties, that it was not possible to define the new government with any precision, and that those must be disappointed who go to that instrument for unqualified support of either one theory or another. Both Mr. Calhoun and Mr. Webster had to be satisfied with inferences and probable argument, and so has Mr. Pomeroy; and, for the matter of that, so have we ourselves. And the reason is, that any thing more definite would have split the Convention, and left the country worse off than it was before. Its members were too wise to be willing to sacrifice the thing for a name.

There were two opposite parties in this Convention. One, headed by Luther Martin, wished to retain the Confederacy with little alteration; the other, led by Hamilton, would have liked to form a complete consolidation of all the States into one nation: the majority of the

members probably occupied middle ground between these two extremes. Of course, neither party had its way. A compromise was made which instituted practically the kind of government that was needed, but left questions of definition to be settled when they came up. The term *nation* was left in abeyance, but the *thing* was brought into life. An end was put to the interregnum or transition of sovereignty, and the various powers and functions of government were enumerated and organized. The practical result was accomplished,—a result on the whole satisfactory to the majority, although perhaps not satisfactory in every particular to any one. But any attempt to say, in so many words, either that the new government was a nation, or that it was a mere confederacy, would have inevitably led to the failure of the whole scheme. They called it, what it certainly was, a Federal Union; and left it for time and circumstances to determine its precise character.

It is at any rate apparent to any one who reads the debates in the conventions, that the Constitution was regarded as establishing a *new government* of the whole people, and was opposed on that ground. Luther Martin refused to sign the document for the reason that “the people at large” had no right to form such an instrument. It is further clear that the powers conferred upon the general government are sovereign in their nature; and that by this act the loose congeries of States was transformed into a vigorous nation, capable of maintaining its dignity and credit, both towards its own citizens and towards foreign nations. The founders of our government were wise. They laid a foundation upon which they trusted that a firm government must be built; and their hopes have not been deceived. The fine-spun subtleties of Calhoun have ever failed to convince the people of the United States that they are not a nation; nor do we believe with Mr. Pomeroy that our nationality depends on so weak a basis as the impossibility of a voluntary alienation of sovereignty.

W. F. A.

## PHILOSOPHY AND SCIENCE.

If Letourneau’s “Physiology of the Passions” \* does not prove any new theory of emotion and sentiment, it certainly classifies facts very carefully and reasons upon them ingeniously. The book is admirably arranged, and is interesting and fascinating from beginning to end.

\* *Physiologie des Passions.* Par CH. LETOURNEAU. Paris: Germer Bailli  re, 1868. 18mo, pp. 230.

How far Letourneau is a materialist, we do not know; for his reasoning is quite consistent with a belief in spiritual substance and in personal immortality. He agrees with the materialists in rejecting the psychological method of studying the soul, and longs for the day when "metaphysics shall die." If the voices of scientific men could decide the question, metaphysics would seem to be already as good as dead, sent to the shades along with other follies and delusions, — alchemy, witchcraft, demoniac possession, and the rest. Metaphysics is now forced to excuse itself for asking a hearing, and has to take the humble tone of a suppliant. A few brave Hegelians continue to raise their voices, but these are only the voices of drowning men, who swim here and there in the vast abyss. *Physiology* now must demonstrate the soul, if its existence is to be allowed and justified.

Letourneau's work is in five books. The first treats of Life and of Needs, and lays out the plan of the subsequent books. He divides the *needs* of man into three classes, — *nutritive* needs of circulation, of digestion, of respiration; *sensitive* needs, — those that bring pleasure, as the generative impulse, and the exercise of the special senses, seeing, hearing, tasting, and the like; and *cerebral* needs, which are moral and intellectual. The moral needs diminish as years go on, and are far more pressing in youth than in age, and in the soul of woman than in the soul of man. Religious needs are classed as cerebral. They vary with impressibility and intelligence. There is no natural religion, unless we call fetichism such, which is the first religion of the child, and of the races so simple and so ignorant as to be no better than children. Naturally, infants are unconscious atheists. From this they go on to fetichism, polytheism, monotheism, and finally to pantheism or atheism, of which they are conscious.

The second book treats of the elements of Passion, of Desire and Will, and of Emotion. Letourneau holds with most of the physiologists, that, strictly speaking, there can be no free-will, that all acts are the inevitable results of predetermined causes. But he allows a *quasi* free-will in the control which many have over passion and in the balance of emotions. He defines the will to be "the power a making all the forces of one's being converge to a given end, when this power acts with an apparent freedom." The consciousness of freedom is as good as real freedom, in the practical work of life.

The third and longest book treats of the passions in themselves, nutritive, sensitive, and cerebral. The sixty pages which are given

to this topic are very instructive on the nutritive passion ; for instance, there are anecdotes of *polyphages*, of immense eaters, whose passion for food could never be satisfied. The grenadier Tarare could eat a quarter of beef in twenty-four hours, and could tear live cats to pieces and eat them. Devise L'Hermina, a French schoolmistress, could eat thirty pounds of bread in a day, and browse on grass like Nebuchadnezzar, without at all troubling her digestion. When she was dying, and could no longer eat, she would have her sister eat, that she might see at any rate what had been her highest pleasure.

The fourth book treats of the progress and changes of passion, how it dies, how it becomes insanity, how it becomes ecstasy. In this book, Letourneau has borrowed largely from the experiences of the Saints,—Augustine, Francis, Loyola, and Theresa. The physical conditions of rapture, as he states them, quite rob this heavenly state of its spirituality. St. Theresa is shown as no better than an insane dervish, and her visions and exaltations are the natural product of a brain crazed by fastings and penance.

The fifth book treats of *Passional Physiognomy*, of temperaments and their influences. In this part there is nothing new. The old division of lymphatic, sanguine, nervous, and bilious, is retained, making the apathetic, the active, the sensitive, and the passionate men. Morality depends almost wholly on temperament and circumstance. The ideas of Letourneau on this question of morality are well expressed in the closing sentences of his remarkable book.

“Notions of goodness and justice are not innate and bright in the human brain. They come only from education acting upon the individual and the series of his ancestors. They are not divine or necessary ideas : if they were, what use in your prisons and your hangmen ? Have we need of such stimulants to excite desires which are really innate and natural ? The penal code loudly protests against the philosophic fiction.

“Does it follow that we must not repress and punish where we are not able to hinder, that we must leave free field to all instincts which are hurtful to the individual and to society. Certainly not : we must punish, not in the name of a justice calling itself invariable, by reason of its divine origin, or of a conviction purely intuitive, and consequently infinitely variable ; but in the name of the much more modest idea of the common interest, of utility scientifically determined ; and we mean by utility all that can favor the simultaneous development of the individual and society, all that can raise the individual and the

race as high as possible from the *nutritive* plane, as near as possible to the intellectual and moral summit.

“To do this will require an immense revolution in ideas, and consequently in facts.

“The judge will be less hard and unyielding, when he bears no longer a divine sword; from a cruel priest, he will become a pitying healer. May this little volume hasten in some degree the coming of that happy era!”

C. H. B.

#### MISCELLANY.

“SAUL,”\* by the acknowledgment of all its critics, is a “remarkable” poem. It is remarkable for its choice of subject; for the hard, literal fidelity with which it follows the Scripture narrative; for the immense expansion it gives to the details of it; for the boldness (rather than success) of its attempt to introduce supernatural machinery and *dramatis personæ*; for its vigorous and unconventional handling of poetic raw material, with the most severe and conventional rendering of its main topic; for its great felicity, often, in the use of Scripture language and imagery; for its energy and daring in the use of the dramatic form, and its apparent sympathy with the tone of the Hebrew story, along with a lack of dramatic or historic imagination which makes it valueless as an interpretation of the higher meaning. It is greatly hurt by its excessive length. Its poetic expression, which is often forcible, and its poetic thought, which is often fresh, need the pruning of a skilful and unsparing hand, to relieve it of much that makes its form rude and cumbrous. And, though in dramatic keeping, we do not admire such efforts of wit as this (p. 167):—

“Here’s monkey’s-cap.—Egad! ’twould cap a monkey  
To say what I have gathered;”

“cap” being, as we are informed, Yorkshire for “puzzle” or “surprise.” There is an obvious and painfully scrupulous study to keep the line of story marked out in the Hebrew record,—marred by imagery that speaks of Canadian woods, and not of the hills of Judah, and of pastoral pipes turned to the very modern service of smoking! These things show a mind capable and courageous enough to take its own view and say its own thought independently. But it was

---

\* *Saul: a Drama.* By CHARLES HEAVYSEGE. Boston: Fields, Osgood, & Co.

an error of judgment to attempt the treatment of a topic, which required kindred powers, developed in a larger way, to meet the hard task of interpreting a remote time and people, poetically, to the mind of our own time. It is no disparagement to the author to say, that his training is not equal to his natural vigor, and that his work is an attempt rather than a success.

Mr. Heavysege is an Englishman, from Yorkshire, who has lived in America some fifteen years; a resident of Montreal, who forsook the occupation of wood-carving for that of reporter to the daily press; and was drawn to literature by strong natural bent, rather than special cultivation. Besides this poem, he has published a small volume of Sonnets, a drama called "Count Filippo," and "Jephthah's Daughter," a poetic narrative, which last, in our judgment, is greatly superior to either of his larger works,—the simplicity of outline keeping him closer to the really strong points of his story. A few lines from this poem will illustrate the blending of real vigor and freshness of fancy, with lack of true imagination or dramatic insight:—

" For it befell upon high holiday  
In Gilead, whose quaint-built capital,  
Old Mizpeh, filled her streets with all her throng,  
When Jephthah, followed by his patriot host,  
From Ammon vanquished and her cities spoiled,  
Returned triumphant. Banners filled the air,  
And martial music, and a roar of joy  
From the wild, welcoming multitude, that stood  
Dense as primeval woods, aspiring, spread  
In carnival attire of brightest hues,  
O'er balcony and beam, o'er tower and tree,  
Thick as the blooms of spring on orchard walls;  
And, climbing, clustered on adventured heights  
Till nought was vacant: top of tallest pile  
Was covered, and the nest of crow and crane  
Invaded, whilst the grinning urchin sat  
Astraddle on the gilded, yielding vane."

Every word of this description is vigorous; but every image of it (except the last) is purely modern and conventional. Compare it, for instance, with Matthew Arnold's "Sohrab and Rustum,"—in which there is not a picture that suggests a different landscape than the scene of the tragic tale, or a phrase that reminds one of a later date; or with the absolutely pure paganism of "Atalanta in Calydon." Mr. Heavysege has all the qualities that are needed to

make an admirable *Canadian* poet. Let him take counsel of Mr. Whittier: give us an American poem of "Ottawa," fragrant only of pine woods; or reproduce for us such scenes of life among the Hurons as Mr. Parkman has told us of; and he will find a more cordial welcome and a heartier appreciation from his critics than these more ambitious efforts have received.

THE large number of readers with whom "Friends in Council" has been a favorite book will be glad to see it in a new, handsome, and permanent shape.\* Without quite force enough for dramatic characterization, Mr. Helps has sufficient versatility, fancy, and cultivated observation to give very agreeable outlines of the persons of his dialogue; and the views he offers, in his graceful and thoughtful way, come with a sort of dramatic fitness from their lips. The shrewd, sarcastic, kind-hearted, but keen-tongued lawyer; the thoughtful, cultivated, humane man of letters; the man of the world, pessimistic and self-indulgent; the modest and somewhat bashful scholar; the amiable group of ladies,—do not, perhaps, interest us much as individuals; but they give the necessary relief, in a series of views which would be a little too quietly serious without them. There is some slight approach to humor; but the essays are much more strongly marked by good sense, right feeling, a conscientious thoughtfulness, practised observation, and a style which puts them very high among the better writings of the day. The points of view are those of refined and intellectual English society; but Mr. Helps's own special studies of the Spanish history, character, and people, stand out at intervals in very agreeable relief, and give a more marked value and interest to many of these pages. There is a certain tenderness, too, in his style of thought, which makes his essays singularly wholesome and attractive. Among writings of their class, there are very few which have a superior or equal claim on the attention of the public.

WE are acquainted with Mr. Osborn's dramatic series, of which five volumes are announced, and two already published, only through the two comedies whose titles we give below.\* The first volume,

\* *Friends in Council; a Series of Readings, and Discourse thereon.* New York: James Miller. Second Series.

† *The Montanini: a Comedy;* — also, *The School for Critics: a Comedy,* Being in continuation of the Fourth Volume of the Dramatic Series. By LAUGHTON OSBORN. New York: James Miller.

consisting of the tragedies *Calvary*, *Virginia*, and *Bianco Capello*, has been noticed, and (we should think) unduly disparaged by the newspaper press, to judge from a few specimens which the author cites in his own vindication. “The *Montanini*” is a pleasant romance, pleasantly and dramatically told, of the reconciliation of two patrician houses of Siena long at feud, by the generosity and noble love of one of the rival heads, who interposes to rescue the other from a malicious imprisonment, leading in due course to the betrothal of each to the sister of his foe. “The story is founded on the forty-ninth novel of Bandello,” and seems, with good skill in dramatic dialogue, to be faithfully drawn and colored after the manner of the time, the fourteenth century. Of the tragedies, “*Calvary*” is especially daring, and inevitably offensive in its plot, handling with free hand the characters of scripture story; the plot turning, as we judge from the extracts given, on the love and companionship between Judas Iscariot and Mary Magdalene, for whom, in the straits of poverty, Judas sells his Master to purchase bread,—vainly hoping that he may be forced into a proclamation and establishing of his kingdom! The critics seem to have shown our author little mercy, and to have provoked the reply which the author has made, with bad temper and worse taste, in “*The School for Critics*,”—a travesty quite too coarse to be any thing but disagreeable to the reader, and a damage to the writer. Yet there is vigor in his style of treatment, and abundant courage, and a burst of wholesome honesty now and then. He cites at great length in his notes—which are the entertaining part of this comedy—the unflattering judgments of his natural enemies, the critics; and gives the passages in full which they have mutilated and disparaged. Instead of these, we copy the author’s frank testimonial respecting his own works (p. 511):—

“I venture the assertion, without any hesitancy (because I speak after due comparison), that, whatever the defects of my pieces, there are not, in the whole range of dramatic writing, from *Æschylus* down, any series of *characters* that are better discriminated, more life-like, and more true to nature, than my own.”

THE “Great Dean”—the poet, historian, preacher—has well given his last words to the sanctuary in whose service most of his days have been spent.\* Admiring the structure beyond measure; laboring

\* *Annals of St. Paul’s Cathedral.* By HENRY H. MILMAN, late Dean. London: Murray, 1868.

successfully for its greater usefulness as a place of worship ; rejoicing in its becoming the shrine of renowned warriors, artists, and statesmen,—the close of his services has fitly been the detail of the antiquities of this great English Cathedral, with passing allusions to the leading events in English history, and brief sketches of the prominent personages in church and state. Through the mist of the Roman occupation of England, through the Papal despotism, through the struggles of the Reformation, through bloody persecution, through the great London fire, and the rebuilding by Sir Christopher Wren,—the graceful pen of the Christian historian glides on, sketching a single city church with the interest belonging to the progress of Christianity itself, making St. Paul's Cathedral a sufficient index of the church spirit of England during all these Christian centuries.

In this most acceptable monument to himself, as well as to his sanctuary, the Dean shows the great architect embarrassed, foiled, and disgraced, as modern church-builders so frequently are, by the interference of tasteless committee-men. Though the exterior was Sir Christopher's, except that he was not allowed the wide space he desired to display its fine proportions, the completion of the interior was taken from him, and given to an incompetent person by the name of Benson.

"Benson sole judge of architecture sit,  
And namby-pamby be preferred to wit."

Another curious fact, besides this presumptuous interference with the plans of the greatest of English church-architects, is, that the history of St. Paul's resembles that of other old churches in the abuses of its hallowed precincts. At its west door, the lotteries were drawn during Queen Elizabeth's reign, as has since been the case in some churches at Rome. The church walls were lined with advertisements, not always the most decent ; the nave and aisles were abandoned to thieves, ruffians, and the profligate of both sexes ; the Common Council of London declares that "many of the inhabitants of London made a thoroughfare for fish, flesh, fruit, and other gross wares through the Cathedral" itself ; and Queen Elizabeth had to forbid fighting within its walls by a special penalty. Well might the good Dean exult that of late the finer portion of the Cathedral had been adapted to evening service, and that crowds assembled regularly for united worship amid all that could impress the heart and inspire the soul.

F. W. H.

MANUALS of politeness and etiquette are a class of works which find ready sale, and which increase in number with the increase of wealth and luxury. The man who has made his fortune by traffic in hides or in pork, or by speculations in stocks, and has built his house in some fashionable city street, hastens to learn the ways of good society, and to fit himself for his proper place among the aristocracy. It is important for his sons and daughters to know the rules of courtesy and good breeding, that the advantage of their ample wealth may not be lost or wasted. Most of these treatises are catch-penny works, compiled by men who have small knowledge of fashionable life, much less of "good society," and who have got their information at second hand. Feeble wit, worn-out jokes, and thin moralizing, make the substance of their teaching. But the English Handbook which has now been twice republished,\* is a work of altogether more value, as wise and solid as it is quaint and entertaining. It is not made up of scraps, but is the original thought and advice of those who know of what they speak, and are competent to advise. There are two authors of the book. A bachelor writes the rules and suggestions for gentlemen; and a mature matron tells her sex what they should put on and how they must behave. The book is written for Englishmen and Englishwomen; but, with allowance made for slight differences of custom, it is just as good for the Anglo-Saxon race on this side of the sea, or for any race in civilized society. Very few of its suggestions are out of place, and none are fantastic. The long title exactly describes it, and it shows the way of making one's self agreeable in the ordinary duties and relations of social life.

The greatest annoyances in life are in perplexities about common things. The sins that easily beset us are failures in propriety, violations of good taste and good breeding; and far more misery comes from these than from remorse for heinous wrongs. How to carve, how to salute, how to shake hands, how to talk in company, whom to invite to parties, how to dress the body, how to arrange the hair, how to wear ornaments, how to get along with servants, how to

---

\* *The Habits of Good Society. A Handbook for Ladies and Gentlemen: with thoughts, hints, and anecdotes concerning social observances, nice points of taste, and good manners; and the art of making one's self agreeable.* The whole interspersed with humorous illustrations of social predicaments; remarks on the history and changes of fashion; and the differences of English and Continental etiquette. (From the last London edition.) New York: Carleton, 1868. 12mo, pp. 430.

walk, how to sit, how to cough, and how to laugh,—all these seeming trifles are the source of endless anxiety of mind. One who can enlighten us in these things is a real benefactor. And there are very few persons of either sex who cannot be helped by hints concerning these social needs and duties. None of us are sure that our demeanor and carriage are quite right, and that we have not habits which those around find unpleasant. No teaching of manuals, certainly, will make a perfect gentleman. There is a natural grace and refinement which lessons in etiquette can never give. But many bad habits may be put away by the advice of experts. No handbook can teach a nervous man to speak slowly, or make a very fat man light on horseback or in the dance. Yet the hints of this volume may guide any class in the modulations of the voice, and may save even the unwieldy from excessive awkwardness.

In some things, the chief author of this manual departs from the traditions of English proprieties. He favors the beard, and thinks shaving absurd; he denounces the stiff round hat; he allows smoking in moderation, though not in the presence of ladies; he thinks that wine should be sparingly used, not more than two kinds at a dinner; he has no love for haughty exclusiveness, and thinks that gentlemen sitting next each other in railway cars or at table should speak with each other, and not wait to be introduced; and the practice of "cutting" he abominates, except in extreme cases. He is not a worshipper of rank; he treats all gambling and betting as vulgar; and he does not make field-sports essential to the education of a gentleman. A gentleman ought, nevertheless, to know how to box, to defend himself, and to apply the persuasive argument of a timely and effectual blow, if the emergency calls for it.

C. H. B.

MR. TIMBS has compiled from the standard works of Natural History, and from the best known books of travel, some pleasant sketches of the habits of beasts and birds and fishes.\* But his book is by no means made up of stories of animal oddities and eccentricities. Its title is a misnomer. Because animals belong to a class not very large in the number of its species, it does not follow that they are "eccentric." The rhinoceros is not eccentric, nor the hippopotamus, nor the ant-bear, much less the lion, of which Mr. Timbs has a good deal to

---

\* *Eccentricities of the Animal Creation.* By JOHN TIMBS, author of "Things not Generally Known." Boston: Roberts Brothers, 1869. 16mo, pp. 352.

say. Nor are *humbugs* fairly to be reckoned with animal oddities. Mr. Timbs has a chapter on the mermaid, in which he investigates the history of this strange creature, neglecting, however, to notice the famous Feejee mermaid of the American showman. The conclusion that the whole story is a delusion should have ruled it out of the book. More suitable is the discussion on the Unicorn, which has a possible existence, though in the opinion of Mr. Weller, senior, it is a fabulous animal. Mr. Timbs is not always accurate in his statements, and has made some strange blunders; as on page 13, where, speaking of Montezuma's menagerie, he says, "To this South-American zoölogical garden of the sixteenth century no other of its time could be compared." One who writes about animals in all parts of the world surely ought to know that Mexico is in North America. Then, on page 145, he says that "the fleetest courser can scarcely ever run more than a mile in a minute, nor support that speed beyond five or six such exertions." It is doubtful whether he means that a race-horse can run not more than five or six miles in five or six minutes, or whether he can do his mile in a minute more than five or six different times. In either case, the statement is extravagant, and beyond any recorded facts, so far as we remember. It is rare speed for a horse to run two miles in three minutes. The story of the blackbird's poisoning the young which they were unable to release from their cage (page 218) is a hasty conclusion. Mr. Timbs is not good authority in archæology, and understands the habits of living birds better than he understands fossils or ancient sculptures. We shall not take his opinion as decisive, that man did not "coexist with Mastodons." In the chapter on Talking Birds, he barely mentions the "parrot," while he dwells on the notes of singing-birds, which do not "talk" in any sense. So in the chapter on queer fish, the famous Devil Fish of Victor Hugo's romance is quite left out of the account.

The Index at the close of the volume would be more convenient, if it were more skilfully arranged. While a whole chapter is given to "Penguins," that title is not found in the Index. The subject comes under the head of "Eccentricities." There is a picture of a "Seal" in the book, but no hint of a seal in the Index.

Yet, in spite of its mistakes and its fragmentary character, Mr. Timbs's book is entertaining. The engravings, of which there are eight, are excellent; and the volume is printed in that beautiful style which has given to Roberts Brothers their honorable place among the publishers.

C. H. B.

A SUCCESSFUL missionary's "Ten Years on the Euphrates" \* is no more than Dr. Anderson or any missionary official might have done as well at the bureau in Boston. The most striking fact about Mr. Wheeler's success in Eastern Turkey is the sale in one year at Harpoot of over two thousand gold dollars' worth of Bibles, showing a native demand for the word of life more remarkable than the steady increase of missionary stations, and their growing independence of foreign aid. There is almost no information given of the country or its inhabitants, no description of scenery, no narrative of events; but a great deal of shrewd advice is given to missionaries against trusting to appearances, since the gift of medicines, still more of books, gathers a crowd who are really injured by being thus treated as paupers; while, with regard to the gift, the principle holds that what people pay for, they really value. Concerts of prayer for missions, he says, are falling into neglect. Where missionaries break the costly home intercourse, they are said to sink to the level of the surrounding heathen. Common sense, knowledge of human nature, and freedom from fastidious tastes, are necessary to the successful missionary, not to say the gift of manufacturing dull books on interesting lands, which leave the reader no wiser when he has finished than before he began.

F. W. H.

MISSIONARY SHERRING devotes a large volume † to a minute description of the holy city of Benares, because being the living oracle of the nation, presiding over the religious destiny of one hundred and eighty millions, its future requires study. Here Hinduism is at home, in the bosom of its friends and admirers, courted by princes and millionaires, sustained by innumerable resources, embellished by thousands of temples and hundreds of thousands of idols, swarming with pilgrims, and crowned with the offerings of a superstitious devotion. Unhappily, he confines himself too much to the surface of things, giving us the dimensions of one temple after another in tedious iteration; the abundance of images, the superabundant filth, the manifest decay, the half-hidden traces of more ancient structures, marking them with a general uniformity. These shrines of one of the oldest religions are neither so vast, so beautiful, nor so worthy of imitation, as to require or repay this minute delineation. But very few and imperfectly illustrated are

\* *Ten Years on the Euphrates.* By Rev. C. H. WHEELER. Published by the American Tract Society, 1868.

† *The Sacred City of the Hindus.* By Rev. M. A. SHERRING. With an Introduction, by Fitzedward Hall. London: Trübner & Co., 1868.

Mr. Sherring's views of the condition of Hinduism itself and its future. Judged externally, it was never so flourishing; making extraordinary effort to maintain itself against the inroads of European civilization under its priests, pundits, and princes; maintaining this immense city almost upon piety alone, gathering pilgrims by the acre, numbering its still occupied temples in its sacred city by the thousand. But beneath all this parade of piety is the increase of the thirst for knowledge as never before, the multiplication of debating societies, the predilection of young men for study, and the absolute freedom of thought; above all, the spreading sect of the Brahmos, who co-operate with the telegraph and railroad, the canal and the metalled road, in throwing India open to the quickening civilization of Europe. Few, indeed, study the Vedas now; Sanscrit is getting out of date; all classes are becoming scandalized by idolatry; Hinduism is held by a relaxing grasp; whenever the tide changes openly, when the warm imagination of the Hindu is turned to Christianity, and his heart vitalized by its influence, India will lead the rest of Asia in casting her idols away, will be the servant of a new civilization and the herald of a higher humanity.

F. W. H.

THE most curious as well as useful of the books by the author of "Self-Help," is the last,\* the history of the creation of English manufactures through the persecution of French Protestants. It is strange to see England, as a merely pastoral country, importing all its clothing &c., until the Flemish artisans, exiled by civil war, and the French weavers, driven out by Romish persecution, built up the industry, wealth, and independence of Great Britain. Sismondi states that France lost nearly a million of population soon after the revocation of the Edict of Nantes; and, though some of it perished miserably enough, a large share went to create the manufacturing skill of England. Wherever the French Huguenot settled, the neighborhood flourished: new industries were introduced, wealth flowed in; France experienced a permanent loss, while England obtained an independence of which it had not dreamed. It is singular that so many names of familiar articles have been derived from the seats of their production abroad,—mechlin lace, of Mechlin; diaper, of Ypres; cambrie, of Cambray; tulle, of Tulle; damask, of Damascus; dimity, of Damietta; delph ware, from Delft; venetian glass, from Venice; cordovan

\* The Huguenots: Their Settlements, Churches, and Industries in England and Ireland. By SAMUEL SMILES. London: John Murray, 1867.

leather, from Cordova; and millinery, from Milan. But it is amusing to find so many distinguished persons in the highest walks of life, whom the Huguenot persecution gave to England. As a necessary result the French revolution found "emptiness of pocket, of stomach, of head, and of heart;" found the Bayles, Claudes, saviors of a century before, replaced by Voltaire, Rousseau, and Diderot; found the God of the Huguenot's Bible exchanged for the Goddess of Reason, and the very clergy (who had exulted over the extinction of a worship different from their own) driven forth over the same roads to the same galley-slavery, or fleeing over the sea for refuge in the same English asylum. The Huguenots' descendants remain in the same localities where they originally settled. The industries they introduced still flourish, their horror at religious oppression continues unchanged; but their distinct worship has generally ceased, as was desirable. Providence, certainly, has never preached a more emphatic discourse on the crime of religious persecution than in the wretchedness which France experienced through the banishment of its most intelligent, productive, virtuous, heroic citizens, because of their heresy.

F. W. H.

THE manful, simple, consecrated life of the true missionary, Conant, has not waited five years in vain for a biographer.\* His openness of soul, his downrightness of action, his sustained fervor, his perfect practicality, make this history one of the most valuable ever written for hard workers in new places. While we beguiled a late hour with this almost autobiographic memoir, Macleod's "Earnest Student" lay open on the table, suggesting a contrast which may bring two books into notice at once. With ten times the profession, there is not a tenth part as much practice of self-dedication in John Mackintosh as in Augustus Conant; and not a hundredth part of the genuine service to humanity. With abundant means, Mackintosh travelled much, studied hard, attended theological lectures till nearly thirty years of age, when he died of consumption; having distributed, meanwhile, religious tracts; talked earnestly, especially with Jews, on spiritual themes, written on behalf of personal religion to all within his circle, and made constant preparation for the ministry of the Free Church in Scotland; this told the story of his earnestness.

\* *A Man in Earnest: Life of A. H. Conant.* By ROBERT COLLYER. Boston. Horace B. Fuller, 1868.

With far less ability and no money, with no social or college culture, this Western farmer threw himself into the least compensated, most incessant, and exacting work done under the sun ; started one society with which his name is identified, and revived another, which will never forget his unpretending goodness, while one who knew him in the flesh remains ; and all his labor was elevated and blest by being done to deliver others, as he had himself been delivered, from darkness of soul unto spiritual light, peace, joy. At last, feeling that his country's struggle demanded every kind of help, and knowing how much practical ability of various sorts his struggle with life had developed, Conant went down into the battle, not as a formal prayer-maker, but as a good Samaritan, preaching such practical sermons as upon the value of straw to the soldier, working with might and main for temperance, watching over the sick, bringing the wounded into hospital, cheering the dying under the leaden hail itself, there to fall at last in the Brigade Hospital of Murfreesborough, a willing sacrifice, an unglorified martyr. And this was Augustus Conant's earnestness. The biography is very much like the boy's tune, which "was so good that it whistled itself ;" but the sermon at the close deserved to be preserved in this enduring form, as like Starr King's address at Colonel Baker's grave, a monument more enduring than marble, the outflow of an affection more eloquent than any words.

F. W. H.

---

#### NEW PUBLICATIONS RECEIVED.

Notes, Critical, Explanatory, and Practical, on the Book of Psalms. By Albert Barnes. In three volumes. Vols. II. and III. 12mo, pp. 383. \$1.50 ;

It is Never too Late to Mend. A matter-of-fact Romance. By Charles Reade. 8vo, paper, pp. 242. 35c. ;

Breaking a Butterfly; or, Blanche Ellerslie's Ending. By the author of "Guy Livingstone," "Sword and Gown," &c. 8vo, paper, pp. 139. 35c. ;

The Malay Archipelago. The Land of the Orang-Outang, and the Bird of Paradise. A Narrative of Travel, with Studies of Man and Nature. By Alfred Russel Wallace, author of "Travels on the Amazon and Rio Negra," "Palm-trees of the Amazon," &c. 8vo, cloth, pp. 598. \$3.50 ;

Kathleen. By the author of "Raymond's Heroine." 8vo, paper, pp. 183. 50c. ;

The Student's Scripture History. The Old-Testament History. From the Creation to the return of the Jews from the Captivity. Edited by William Smith, LL.D. Classical Examiner in the University of London. With Maps and Woodcuts. 12mo, cloth, pp. 704;

For Her Sake. By Frederick W. Robinson, author of "Carry's Confession," &c. Illustrated. 8vo, paper, pp. 191. 75c.;

The Dodge Club; or, Italy in MDCCCLIX. By James De Mille, author of "Cord and Creese; or, The Brandon Mystery," &c. With one hundred Illustrations. 8vo, paper, pp. 133. 75c.;

The Virginians. A Tale of the Last Century. By William Makepeace Thackeray. With Illustrations by the author. 8vo, paper, pp. 411. 75c.;

Three Seasons in European Vineyards. Treating of Vine Culture, Vine Disease and its Cure. Wine-making and Wines, Red and White. Wine-drinking, as affecting health and morals. By William J. Flagg. New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo, cloth, pp. 321. \$1.50.

Evening by Evening; or, Readings at Eventide. For the family or the closet. By C. H. Spurgeon. New York: Sheldon & Co. 12mo, cloth, pp. 396. \$1.75;

The Villa on the Rhine. By Berthold Auerbach. Author's edition. With a Portrait of the author, and a Biographical Sketch by Bayard Taylor. Vols. I. and II. pp. 1521. \$3.50. The same. Parts I., II., III., IV., \$3.00;

Black Forest Village Stories. By Berthold Auerbach. Translated by Charles Goepp. Author's edition. Illustrated with Fac-similes of the original German woodcuts. 12mo, cloth, pp. 377. \$1.50;

Problematic Characters. A Novel. By Friedrich Spirlhagen, from the German, by Professor Schele De Vere. Author's edition. 12mo, cloth, pp. 507. \$1.75;

Mental Photographs. An Album for Confessions of Tastes, Habits, and Convictions. Edited by Robert Saxton. Quarto square, cloth. \$1.50;

Italy, Florence, and Venice. From the French of H. Taine. By J. Durand. New York: Leypoldt & Holt. 8vo, vellum cloth, pp. 378. \$2.50;

Thunder and Lightning. By W. De Fonvielle. Translated from the French, and edited by T. L. Phipson, Ph. D., F.C.S., &c. Illustrated with Thirty-nine Engravings on wood. 1 vol. 12mo, cloth, pp. 285. \$1.50;

The Wonders of Optics. By F. Marion. Translated from the French, and edited by Charles W. Quin, F.C.S. Illustrated with Seventy Engravings on wood; and a colored Frontispiece. 1 vol. 12mo, cloth, pp. 276. \$1.50;

The Phenomena and Laws of Heat. By Achille Carzin, Professor of Physics in the Lyceum of Versailles. Translated and edited by Elihu Rich, editor of Griffin's "Cyclopaedia of Biography" and "Occult Sciences," late editor of "The People's Magazine," &c., &c. 1 vol. 12mo, cloth, pp. 265. \$1.50;

Chips from a German Workshop. By Max Müller, M.A., Fellow of All-Souls College, Oxford. 2 vols. Vol. I. Essays on the Science of Religion.

Vol. II. Essays on Mythology, Traditions, and Customs. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 12mo, cloth, pp. 727. \$5.00. (See *Christian Examiner*, May, 1868.)

No Sects in Heaven, and Other Poems. By Mrs. E. H. J. Cleaveland. 18mo, cloth, pp. 90. \$1.25.

The Symbolism of Freemasonry. Illustrating and explaining its Science and Philosophy. Its Legends, Myths, and Symbols. By Albert G. Mackey, M.D., author of "Lexicon of Freemasonry," "Text-Book of Masonic Jurisprudence," "Cryptic Masonry," &c., &c. New York: Clark & Maynard. 8vo, cloth, pp. 311. \$2.25.

Aspects of Humanity, brokenly mirrored in the ever-swelling Current of Human Speech. Philadelphia: J. B. Lippincott & Co. 12mo, cloth, pp. 55. With Appendix. 75c.

The Sermons of Henry Ward Beecher, in Plymouth Church, Brooklyn. From verbatim reports by T. J. Ellinwood, "Plymouth Pulpit." First Series. September, 1868 — March, 1869. New York: J. B. Ford & Co. 8vo, cloth, pp. 438. \$2.50.

The Four Gospels. Translated from the Greek Text of Tischendorf. With the various readings of Griesbach, Lachmann, Tischendorf, Tregelles, Meyer, Alford, and others, and with Critical and Expository Notes. By Nathaniel S. Folsom. Boston: A. Williams & Co. 12mo, cloth, pp. 476.

The Dance of Modern Society. By W. C. Wilkinson. New York: Oakley, Mason, & Co. 16mo, cloth, pp. 77. \$1.

Villa Eden. The Country House on the Rhine. By Berthold Auerbach, author of "On the Heights," "Edelweiss," &c. Translated by Charles C. Shackford. Part II. Boston: Roberts Brothers. 8vo, paper, pp. 327. 50c.

Leander; or, Secrets of the Priesthood. By Ernest Truman. Philadelphia: Claxton, Remsen, & Haffelfinger. 8vo, paper, pp. 76.

Woman's Suffrage. The Reform against Nature. By Horace Bushnell. New York: Charles Scribner & Co. 12mo, cloth, pp. 184. \$1.50.

The Sacristan's Household. A Story of Lippe-Detmold. By the author of "Mabel's Progress," "Aunt Margaret's Trouble," &c. With illustrations by C. G. Bush. 8vo, paper, pp. 158. 75c.

He Knew He Was Right. Part Second. By Anthony Trollope. With Illustrations by Marcus Stone. 8vo, paper, pp. 335. 50c.

Five Acres too Much. A truthful elucidation of the attractions of the country, and a careful consideration of the question of profit and loss as involved in amateur farming, with much valuable advice and instruction to those about purchasing large or small places in the rural districts. By Robert B. Roosevelt, author of "Game Fish of North America," "Superior Fishing, Game Birds," &c. New York: Harper & Brothers. 12mo, cloth, pp. 296. \$1.50.

The Habermeister. A Tale of the Bavarian Mountains. Translated from the German of Henry Schmid. 16mo, cloth, pp. 379. \$1.50.

*Stretton. A Novel.* By Henry Kingsley, author of "Ravenshoe," "Geoffry Hamlyn," "Hillyars and the Burtons," &c. Illustrated. New York: Leypoldt & Holt. 8vo, paper, pp. 250.

*Little Women; or, Meg, Jo, Beth, and Amy.* Part Second. By Louisa M. Alcott. With Illustrations. Boston: Roberts Brothers. pp. 359.

*Friends in Council: a Series of Readings, and Discourse thereon.* By Arthur Helps. A New Edition. New York: James Miller. 2 vols. (These volumes, with their charming mixture of Dialogue and Essay have held their place in public regard for more than twenty years, and are well worthy of the reputation which they were first to establish, of their writer, as "the most delightful essayist since Lamb and Hunt,—everywhere exhibiting acuteness, humor, a satire which gives no pain, and a quiet depth of moral feeling manifesting itself in an earnest recognition of man's social responsibilities; while his style, in qualities of purity and clearness, can hardly be matched amongst his contemporaries.")

*Studies in the Evidences of Christianity.* By Stephen G. Bulfinch, D.D. Boston: William V. Spencer. pp. 274. (This volume is a sequel to the "Manual of the Evidences," but in fulness and style of treatment is an independent work. Its value is much increased by including, besides the more usual topics, a reasonably full account of German and Oriental systems; of Apollonius, "the Christ of Philosophy;" of Mormonism and Babism, as well as a discussion of Baur's views respecting the Apostolic period, and of the argument bearing on the Fourth Gospel. Its opinions are clearly defined; its pages bear everywhere the marks of careful and honest study; while its style of treatment is fair, candid, and courteous.)

*Malbone: an Oldport Romance.* By T. W. Higginson. Boston: Fields, Osgood, & Co.

*Oldtown Folks.* By Harriet Beecher Stowe. Boston: Fields, Osgood, & Co.

*Walter Savage Landor: a Biography.* By John Foster. In Eight Books. Boston: Fields, Osgood, & Co.